REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 834 24
STUDENT DISHONESTY AND ITS CONTROL IN COLLEGE.
BY- BOWERS, WILLIAM J.
COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, BUR. OF APP. SOC. RES.
REPORT NUMBER CRP-1672 PUB DATE DEC 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.45 HC-$11.64 291P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CHEATING, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *SURVEYS, QUESTIONNAIRES, *PERSONAL VALUES, PEER ACCEPTANCE, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES WAS STUDIED. DATA WERE COLLECTED BY A QUESTIONNAIRE TO A NATIONWIDE REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE. QUESTIONNAIRES WERE FIRST SENT TO DEANS OF STUDENTS AND STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS. RESPONSES WERE OBTAINED FROM MORE THAN 600 DEANS AND 500 STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS. THE DATA PROVIDED IDEAS AND PROBLEMS TO BE STUDIED MORE INTENSIVELY IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE STUDY. QUESTIONNAIRES WERE THEN SENT TO A SAMPLE OF STUDENTS DRAWN FROM 99 SCHOOLS REPRESENTED BY DEANS AND STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS OF THE PREVIOUS STAGE. COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RECEIVED FROM 5,000 STUDENTS. THE REPORT OF ANALYSES INCLUDED (1) THE PROBLEM OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN CONTEXT, (2) THE SETTING IN WHICH ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OCCURS, (3) MEASURES OF CHEATING, (4) ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND CHEATING, (5) VALUE-ORIENTATION AND CHEATING, (6) HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND CHEATING, (7) PEER DISAPPROVAL AND CHEATING, (8) COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE LEVEL OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY, AND (9) INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTROLLING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. A MAJOR FINDING INDICATED THAT MEMBERS OF THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY GROSSLY UNDERESTIMATED THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM--AT LEAST HALF THE STUDENTS HAD ENGAGED IN SOME FORM OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. FURTHER ACTIVITIES WERE SUGGESTED TO EXPLORE THE EFFECTS OF VARIOUS BACKGROUND FACTORS ON A STUDENT'S PERSONAL SENSE OF DISAPPROVAL OF CHEATING. (RS)

ED003834

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

STUDENT DISHONESTY AND ITS CONTROL IN COLLEGE

Cooperative Research Project No. OE 1672

William J. Bowers

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University New York 27, New York

December 1964

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Copyright c 1964, Bureau of Applied Social Research

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study derives from the conviction that cheating on the college campus offers a strategic research setting for examining deviant behavior and social control. With the methods of survey research, we can gather systematic empirical data not only about college cheating and the conditions under which it occurs, but also about efforts to control it in different social contexts.

The study has its origins in my own college experience and took form during my graduate study at Columbia. At my own college, I experienced a social context in which academic integrity was successfully sustained and enforced. From my teachers at Columbia, especially Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazersfeld, I gained a better understanding of the connection between social structure and deviant behavior and of ways to take account of the social context of behavior.

I am grateful to my friends and colleagues at Columbia for their ideas and support during the formative stage of the project. Discussions with Richard Pomeroy and John Meyer helped me lay the groundwork for the study, and the encouragement of Candace Rogers, Joan Dulchin, and Gerald Hage--my orals study group--strengthened my commitment to the research. I am particularly grateful to Candace Rogers, who has been a continuing source of help and encouragement.

The research itself is the result of the cooperative efforts of a great many people. Frank Furstenberg, Larry Mitchell, and Philip Sidel contributed valuable assistance during the early stages of the project. I was particularly fortunate to have Angela Lane as a research assistant during most of the duration of the project. The quality and spirit of her work were exceptional. A number of others associated with the project also made contributions beyond what was asked of them: John and Judith Model, Arthur Pappidas, Betsy Wallace, Malcolm Imbrie, Jr., Diana Munzer, and Muriel Garon.

I have received invaluable assistance in the preparation of this report. Terrance Hopkins gave useful suggestions about how to reorganize the materials and improve the style of my initial draft. David Caplowitz has worked closely with me during the last three months, helping to improve the final product in numerous respects. His research and editorial sensibilities have contributed continuity to the flow of ideas, coherence to the logic of the arguments, and clarity to the style of presentation. He has taught me a great deal about uncovering and presenting the story that the data reveal. I am particularly grateful for this apprenticeship.

To Jane Bowers, my wife, I am thankful for constructive criticism and continual encouragement despite the inconveniences my work caused her. She has made many helpful comments on the various drafts and has taken care of the numerous editorial details of preparing this draft for the typist. I also wish to express my appreciation to Eugene Hudson who has typed the manuscript.

I owe a special debt of thanks to several staff members of the Bureau of Applied Social Research. David Sills took an interest in the venture at a critical point and helped me prepare the research proposal. Allen Barton served as principal investigator on the study, contributing helpful suggestions and advice throughout. Jerome Carlin and Arnold Simmel have made their counsel available to me whenever I needed it. Helmut Guttenberg and his staff have been of considerable assistance in processing the data. And Clara Shapiro has somehow kept the whole research operation moving, difficult as that task has been.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the officers of the United States National Student Association, whose interest in this work has been a source of encouragement, and to the staff of the Russell B. Stearns Study at Northeastern University, who are themselves conducting research on the problem of academic dishonesty and with whom I have had working contact.

Of course, the project owes its existence to our respondents--deans, student body presidents, and students from many colleges and universities across the country--and to the U. S. Office of Education, whose support made the research possible.

W. J. B.
12/64

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments iii

Table of Contents vii

List of Tables xi

I INTRODUCTION 1

- Previous Research on Academic Dishonesty 5
- The Design of the Study 7

II THE PROBLEM OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN CONTEXT 13

- Seriousness of the Problem 13
- Modes of Handling the Problem 18

III THE SETTING IN WHICH ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OCCURS 24

- General Characteristics of Courses and Academic Dishonesty 27
- The Testing Situation 32

IV MEASURES OF CHEATING 37

- Students' Experiences with the Cheating of Others . . . 38
- Students' Reports on Their Own Cheating Behavior . . . 42
    - Four Forms of Academic Dishonesty 42
    - Thirteen Specific Acts 46
    - Self-Defined Cheating: Recent Cheating Experiences 49
- Interpreting the Difference 52
- Year in School and Academic Dishonesty 62

V ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND CHEATING 67

- Students' Attitudes Toward Cheating 68
- Academic Performance and Cheating: The Role of Grades 72
- Study Habits and Cheating: 79
- Academic Awards, Scholarships, and Cheating 85
- The Importance of Grades and Cheating 86

VI VALUE-ORIENTATION AND CHEATING 99

Orientation to the Intellectual and Social Aspects of College 99
Involvement in Campus Social Life and Cheating 106
Orientation to College, Disapproval of Cheating and Grades 111

VII HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND CHEATING 117

The Cheating Syndrome in High School 119
Academic Performance Patterns and Cheating Careers . . 129
Value-Orientation Patterns and Cheating Career 134

VIII PEER DISAPPROVAL AND CHEATING 139

Students' Reaction to Those Who Cheat 140
Students' Perception of Disapproval 144
Peer Group Disapproval and Academic Dishonesty 146
Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 153
The Campus Climate of Disapproval and the Cheating History of Students 157

IX COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE LEVEL OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY 161

The Role of School Quality 165
Sex Composition and Size of Enrollment 170

X INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTROLLING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY 179

Formal Arrangements for Social Control 179
Arrangements for Control, Sex Composition, and Level of Cheating 186
Arrangements for Control, School Size, and Level of Cheating 189

XI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 193

Summary of Findings 193
Directions for Further Research 200

APPENDICES

A SOCIAL BACKGROUND FACTORS AND CHEATING 205

Sex and Religion 206
Indicators of Social Class 210

B INDICES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY FOR THE COLLEGE 215

C THE SAMPLES 221

Sample of Deans and of Student Body Presidents: Stage One 221
Sample of Students: Stage Two 222
The Samples Compared With The Universe 225

D A PROJECTION OF THE LEVEL OF CHEATING BASED ON THE SIZE OF SCHOOL 231

E COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REPRESENTED BY STUDENTS 237

F QUESTIONNAIRE TO DEANS AND STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS 241

G QUESTIONNAIRE TO STUDENTS 257

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Most Serious Problem of Student Discipline 14

2.2 Median Number of Students Brought to the Attention of Authorities During an Eight-Month Period for Each Kind of Offense 16

2.3 Deans' and Student Body Presidents' Estimates of the Proportion of Students of Their Campus Who Cheat or Plagiarize 17

2.4 Individual or Group Who Usually Decides Upon Disciplinary Measure for Each Type of Offense 19

2.5 Per Cent of Respondents Reporting that Students Are Usually Suspended or Expelled for Each Kind of Offense 21

Table 3.1 Per Cent of Courses in Which Various Types of Cheating Occur 26

3.2 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs, by Various Indicators of Course Quality 28

3.3 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Size of Class and Number of Scheduled Tests Given 29

3.4 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs, by Grading System and Use of Unscheduled Tests 30

3.5 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Number of Credits Offered 31

3.6 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Types of Questions Asked on Tests or Exams 33

3.7 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Kinds of Testing Practices 33

3.8 Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Indicators of Classroom Discipline During Tests and Exams 34

Table 4.1 Per Cent of Students Who Have Seen Others Cheating and Who Have Been Asked for Help by Others on Teses or Exams Since Coming to College 38

Table 4.2 Per Cent of Students Who Encountered Other Students Cheating on Various Types of Work in Last-Term Courses 39

4.3 Students' Estimates of the Per Cent of Students on Their Campuses Who Cheat or Plagiarize, Compared With Estimates of Deans and Student Body Presidents 41

4.4 Per Cent of Students Admitting Having Engaged in Various Forms of Cheating Since Coming to College . . 43

4.5 Number of Different Forms of Cheating in Which Students Have Engaged 44

4.6 Per Cent of Students Admitting Ever Having Committed Each of 13 Specific Acts 47

4.7 Per Cent of Students Admitting Various Numbers of Acts 48

4.8 Per Cent of Cheating Incidents Occurring on Various Kinds of Work 50

4.9 Per Cent of Cheating Incidents in Which Various Methods Were Used 50

4.10 Per Cent of Students Who Report Various Numbers of Cheating Incidents 51

4.11 Summary of Findings from Three Questions about Students' Cheating Behavior 52

4.12 Patterns of Classification on the Three Measures of Academic Dishonesty 55

4.13 Per Cent Cheating According to Four Different Measures by Year in School 63

Table 5.1 Students' Attitudes Toward Cheating 69

5.2 Per Cent Cheating by Strength of Personal Disapproval of Cheating 71

5.3 Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average in College 74

5.4 Per Cent Cheating by Year in School and Grade Average 75

5.5 Per Cent Cheating by Personal Disapproval of Cheating and Grade 77

5.6 Per Cent Cheating by Time Spent on Studies 80

Table 5.7 Per Cent Cheating by Three Aspects of Study Habits in Last Term Courses 81

5.8 Per Cent Cheating by Three Indicators of Study Habits in Last Term Courses, Controlling for Time Spent Studying 82

5.9 Per Cent Cheating by Disapproval of Cheating and Efficiency of Study Habits 83

5.10 Per Cent Cheating by Basis of Fellowship Award . . . 86

5.11 Importance Assigned to Grades by Students and Their Parents 88

5.12 Per Cent Cheating by Importance Assigned to Grades by Students and Their Parents 89

5.13 Importance Assigned to Grades by Students and Their Parents, by Grade Average of Students 91

5.14 Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and Students' Evaluation of Good Grades 92

5.15 Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and Perceived Parental Evaluation of Good Grades 93

5.16 Per Cent Cheating by Self-Evaluation of Grades, Parental Evaluation of Grades, and Grade Average . . 95

Table 6.1 The Importance of Four Criteria for Evaluating Other Students 100

6.2 Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College 101

6.3 Per Cent Cheating by Purpose of College Education Considered Most Important 103

6.4 Orientation to College by Purpose of College Education Considered Most Important 104

6.5 Per Cent Cheating by Major Field of Concentration . . 106

6.6 Per Cent Cheating by Frequency of Prearranged Evening Dates and Frequency of Informal Spur-of-the-Moment Dates 108

6.7 Per Cent Cheating by Time Spent During Average Week Watching TV and Playing Cards or Drinking with Friends 109

6.8 Per Cent Cheating by Affiliation with a Social Fraternity or Sorority 110

Table 6.9 Orientation to College as Related to Disapproval of Cheating and to Grade Average 111

6.10 Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College and Attitudes Toward Cheating 112

6.11 Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College and Grade Average 114

Table 7.1 Distribution of Students According to Typology of High School Orientations 120

7.2 Per Cent of Students Who Were Members of the Leading Crowd in Their High School by Orientation in High School 121

7.3 Relationship Between High School Orientation and Orientation in College 123

7.4 Per Cent Cheating in High School by High School Orientation 126

7.5 Per Cent Cheating in High School by High School Grade Average 127

7.6 The Relationship Between Cheating in High School and Cheating in College 128

7.7 The Distribution of Students According to Their Cheating History 128

7.8 Per Cent Cheating in College by College Grades and High School Cheating 130

7.9 Per Cent Cheating in College by College Academic Performance, High School Academic Performance, and High School Cheating 132

7.10 Per Cent Cheating in College by College Orientation and High School Cheating 135

7.11 Per Cent Cheating in College by College Orientation, High School Orientation, and High School Cheating 136

Table 8.1 Students' Reactions at Seeing Various Individuals Cheating on a Test or Exam 141

8.2 Students' Reactions at Being Asked for Help on a Test or Exam by Various Individuals 142

Table 8.3 Students' Perceptions of Disapproval of Cheating Among Various Individuals 144

8.4 Per Cent Cheating by Perceived Peer Group Disapproval 147

8.5 Perceived Peer Group Disapproval Related to Personal Disapproval of Cheating, Grades, and Orientation to College 148

8.6 Per Cent Cheating by Personal Disapproval and Perceived Peer Group Disapproval 149

8.7 Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and Perceived Peer Group Disapproval 151

8.8 Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College and Perceived Peer Group Disapproval 152

8.9 Per Cent Cheating by Climate of Peer Disapproval at Their College 154

8.10 Per Cent Cheating by Perceived Peer Group Disapproval and Climate of Disapproval of the College 156

8.11 Per Cent Cheating in College by High School Cheating and Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 158

Table 9.1 Distribution of Schools by Level of Cheating Among Students 163

9.2 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Climate of Peer Disapproval 164

9.3 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Proportion Admitted Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students 167

9.4 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Faculty-Student Ratio Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs and Students 168

9.5 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Proportion of Students Living on Campus Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students . . . 170

9.6 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Sex Composition Among Schools Represented by Deans, SPBs, and Students 171

Table 9.7 Sex Composition of the College Related to Three Indicators of Quality Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs 173

9.8 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Size of Enrollment Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs and Students 174

9.9 Size of Enrollment of the College Related to Three Other College Characteristics Among Schools Represented by Deans and Student Body Presidents . . 175

9.10 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Sex Composition and Size Among Schools Represented by Deans and Student Body Presidents . . 177

Table 10.1 Distribution of the Three Types of Arrangement for Controlling Academic Dishonesty Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students . . 184

10.2 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangements for Control Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students 185

10.3 Arrangements for Controlling Academic Dishonesty by Sex Composition of the Student Body Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs 186

10.4 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangement for Control and Sex Composition Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs 187

10.5 Arrangements for Controlling Academic Dishonesty by Size of School Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs 189

10.6 Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangements for Control and Size of School Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs 190

Table 11.1 Major Determinants of Academic Dishonesty in College 199

Table A.1 Per Cent Cheating by Sex for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 207

A.2 Per Cent Cheating by Religious Background for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 208

Table A.3 Per Cent Cheating by Fathers' Occupation for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 211

A.4 Per Cent Cheating by Parents' Income for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 212

A.5 Per Cent Cheating by Fathers' Education for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 213

A.6 Per Cent Cheating by Mothers' Education for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College 213

Table B.1 Association Between Component Items and Resulting Index Scores for Deans and Student Body Presidents . . . .

B.2 Association Between Cheating Index Scores for Deans and Student Body Presidents from the Same Colleges . . . .

B.3 Schools Classified in Terms of Level of Cheating by Deans and Students and by Student Body Presidents and Students . . . .

Table C.1 Number of Colleges and Universities Represented by Various Numbers of Students 225

C.2 Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Size of Undergraduate Enrollment 226

C.3 Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Sex Composition of the Student Body 227

C.4 Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Types of Institutional Control 228

C.5 Distribution of Samples and Universe by Geographical Region 229

Table D.1 Distribution of Students by Size of School for the Universe and the Sample, Proportion of the Universe Included in the Sample, and Weights by School Size . 233

D.2 Per Cent Cheating According to Various Questions for the Sample and for the Sample Weighted to Represent the Universe 234

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty on the college campus run contrary to the fundamental values underlying the institution of higher education in America. A tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious scholarly endeavor and scrupulous regard for the academic efforts and contributions of others stands at the foundation of our institutions of higher learning. By virtue of this tradition, the college or university is concerned not simply with imparting knowledge and ideas, but also with instilling a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

The prevalence of academic dishonesty represents failure on the part of the college or university to achieve fundamental educational objectives. Students who cheat have obviously failed to internalize standards of academic integrity, and they may well have failed to master the academic and intellectual offerings of their college. Although other forms of misconduct may cause problems on the campus and represent failure to maintain standards of conduct, they do not contradict the fundamental values of the institution. They may interfere with the effective and efficient operation of the college and thereby hinder its efforts to achieve educational objectives, but they do not directly challenge these objectives.

Academic dishonesty also represents failure on the part of the student to receive the full benefits of the educational experience. The student who develops little commitment to the value of honesty and integrity in academic matters, spends little time or effort on his school work, and passes through college with only a fragmentary and partial knowledge of the subject matter of his courses is deprived of many of the fruits of the educational process.

Moreover, the honest student suffers along with the dishonest one. To the extent that academic dishonesty prevails and goes undetected, students will receive grades for work they have not done--rewards to which they are not entitled. When good grades go to those who cheat successfully as well as to those who work hard on their studies, the grading system loses its power to motivate students to take their studies seriously and to invest time and effort in their schoolwork. Students are deprived of an environment in which honest academic effort is the only path to success.

For the honest student, this presents a demoralizing situation. He will be aware that many of his peers have cheated; in fact, some of them probably will have asked him to join them or help them out in an attempt to cheat. He will see others bettering their grades by cheating and will himself feel temptations and pressures to cheat. In short, on the campus at which academic dishonesty prevails, the honest student will be deprived of the best setting for intellectual growth and the development of academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty also creates a problem for faculty and administration. It frustrates the instructor's efforts to impart knowledge and to engender respect for independent critical thinking among students. He labors under a burden if he must be on the lookout for cheating when he gives tests or makes assignments, and he will have to be satisfied with limited success at teaching if the prevalence of academic dishonesty has weakened students' interest in school work, their motivation to study, and their sense of academic integrity.

Each case of cheating, plagiarism, and the like that comes to the attention of the administration requires time and energy. The facts of the case must be heard, and the student's record must be reviewed. The course instructor and perhaps other faculty members and students may have to be consulted before a decision can be reached. There is also the problem of dealing with the parents of the student if the case is deemed sufficiently serious that they should know about it. And, of course, the administrator must concern himself with publicity about the incident; it must be handled to avoid damage to the reputation of the college. All this robs the administrator of time and energy that he might fruitfully spend on other matters.

Academic dishonesty, then, appears to interfere with what is supposed to be the cooperative effort of students, faculty, and administration to achieve basic goals of the educational process. It creates problems for each of these status groups in their pursuit of educational objectives. Its consequences may not be confined to educational institutions, however. It is clearly an educational problem, but it may also have unfortunate implications outside the realm of college experience. It may be linked with problems in the personality of the individual and with problems in society at large.

For the individual, cheating, plagiarism, and the like may represent an emerging personality problem. It may reflect an inability to face legitimate demands placed on him by other persons. It would certainly seem to foster a disregard for socially accepted norms of conduct and to reinforce an inclination to find "the easy way" or to "get around" obligations he is supposed to accept and live up to as a member of society.

The tendency to develop a disposition in one social context and to carry it into another suggests how academic dishonesty in college may lead to dishonesty and deceit in other areas of social life. The person who finds that dishonesty pays off in college, that it brings him what he wants and may not be able to acquire through honest effort, may try it in his occupation and in other activities, from paying taxes to obeying traffic laws.

The occurrence of dishonesty in college is especially lamentable. As one of society's primary socializing agencies, the college is responsible for selecting the most able and promising members of the younger generation and for preparing them to become the future leaders of society. It is supposed to instill values and standards of conduct in those who will take positions of responsibility and influence--in those who will set the standards that others adopt and serve as examples for others to follow. To the extent that dishonesty in college leads to dishonesty after college, it will do so among the more prominent members of society and, perhaps, through their influence and example, spread in society at large.

The professions, more than other occupations, may suffer the consequences of dishonesty and deceit in college. College stands at the gateway to the professions, and they stand apart from the other occupations in terms of the responsibility and integrity required of their practitioners. The professional is entrusted with special knowledge and skills and with intimate personal information from his client. He has extraordinary power to help or to take advantage of his client's needs. If those who become professionals fail to develop a strong disposition toward integrity and honesty during the period before they enter their fields, they may misuse the rights and privileges with which they are entrusted. Success in achieving professional objectives depends on the esteem and respect of the public, which, in turn, depends on how honest and scrupulous professionals are in their work.

As a problem for the individual, for the society, and for the system of higher education, academic dishonesty merits our attention. The problem may become even more serious if college attendance continues to rise and pressures for academic success grow more intense. No doubt, it now constitutes a serious problem of student discipline at a number of schools. If we are to have an understanding of the problem and of how to remedy it on various kinds of campuses, we must (1) determine how much academic dishonesty goes on among college students, (2) identify the sources and pressures contributing to academic dishonesty in college, and (3) evaluate the effectiveness of various arrangements for controlling this form of behavior. In broad terms, these are the objectives of the present study.

Previous Research on Academic Dishonesty

Judging from the coverage it has received in newspapers both on the campus and in local communities, in popular magazines, and in scholarly journals,[1] the problem of academic dishonesty has not gone unrecognized. Yet little is known about how much academic dishonesty there is, what produces it, and how to reduce it. Most of the research on this problem has been limited in design and method and has yielded only sparse and inconclusive findings.

---

[1] A bibliography comprising over 400 references to newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, and books dealing with the problem of academic dishonesty has been compiled as a project of the Russell B. Sterns Center, a center for research in social and ethical behavior at Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

An impressive effort to uncover the causes of dishonesty and deceit in areas of activity including the academic realm was carried out in the 1920's by Hartshorne and May.[2] Their program of experimentation with grade school children represents a milestone in the application of empirical research methods to problems of social and ethical conduct. But, although the investigators used many imaginative and resourceful approaches in trying to identify and measure personality traits associated with deceit, they were forced to conclude that " the child's deception is as much a function of the particular situation in which he is placed as it is of his own inner experience and training."[3]

This classic study prompted research by other investigators, some of it focusing on arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty. Not long after Hartshorne and May published their work, William Campbell made an attempt to compare the effects of an honor system and a proctoring system on the cheating behavior of college students.[4] His study was limited in its scope and design, but it indicated that students are less likely to cheat if they are put on their honor than if they have the opportunity to cheat without being honor-bound.

---

[2] Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May, Studies in Deceit (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928).

[3] Ibid., p. 400.

[4] William G. Campbell, A Comparative Investigation of Students Under an Honor System and a Proctor System in the Same University (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1935).

Surveys have been conducted on a number of college campuses to see how much academic dishonesty goes on--what proportion of the students have cheated and how much cheating they have engaged in. Some of these efforts have taken information from students at several different schools to get a broader base for estimating the level of academic dishonesty among college students. A recently published investigation providing this kind of information is the Cornell Value Study.[5] This study reveals that nearly two out of five students polled at 11 colleges and universities freely admitted copying from another student or using crib notes during an examination since coming to college; one out of five admitted having done so "more than once." Cheating was not found to be equally prevalent at all schools; as many as half of the students at one school admitted cheating, whereas the fraction was only one tenth at another.

The present research project is designed to enlarge the scope and extend the findings of these and other previous studies by gathering data on a nationwide basis for a more representative picture of the problem, by obtaining information that is both more comprehensive and more detailed, and by attempting to combine into a single research effort three objectives of previous research--identifying sources of cheating, evaluating remedies, and estimating rates.

The Design of the Study

A brief review of our design and procedures for collecting data will suggest how this study differs from earlier efforts. Somewhat more detail about the kinds of data we have collected, how it was gathered, and our rationale for collecting it will provide an orientation to the materials we shall present in the body of the report.[6]

---

[5] Rose K. Goldsen, et al., What College Students Think (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1960).

We collected data in two stages. First we sent questionnaires to deans of students and student body presidents at all regionally accredited colleges and universities across the country in the spring of 1962. This survey was designed to give us a comprehensive picture of the problem of academic dishonesty as seen by campus authorities. These questionnaires were returned by more than 600 deans and over 500 student body presidents.

In effect, deans and student body presidents serve as informants about the problem of academic dishonesty at their schools. On many campuses they deal directly with the problem; they have a good idea of how serious it is, how cases are handled, who takes responsibility for disciplinary action, and what disciplinary measures are usually taken. The information provided by the deans and student body presidents also served some of the functions of a pilot study. In particular, it helped to determine what ideas and problems should be attacked more directly and intensively in the subsequent phase of data collection--the questionnaire to students.

Ninety-nine schools were selected for more intensive study in the second stage of data gathering. These schools were selected from those represented by deans and student body presidents in the earlier stage. In the spring of 1963, questionnaires were sent to a sample of students drawn at each of these schools. About 5000 students returned questionnaires--approximately 50 per college.

---

[6] For a more complete and detailed description of the study design and sampling procedures, see Appendix C.

Like the dean and the student body president, students at a college were also relied upon as informants to provide data on the school and its problem with academic dishonesty. Of primary importance for our purposes, however, is the information students provided on their own values, attitudes, and behavior.

In short, we have gathered data from deans, student body presidents, and students about the college, the student, and the incident of academic dishonesty. Having data that come from several different sources and that characterize several different units of analysis enables us to pursue lines of inquiry not generally attempted in survey research. Basically, the opportunities derive from being able to take richer and more complex data into account in our analysis.

First, the design permits us to bring data on different units of investigation together in the same analysis. Thus, individuals may be characterized by properties of the groups to which they belong, and conversely, groups may be characterized by attributes of their members. We can characterize students according to the kinds of colleges they attend; for example, we can classify them according to the quality or the size of their schools. Conversely, we can classify colleges in terms of the attributes of their students; for example, we can rate colleges according to the amount of cheating that goes on.[7]

---

[7] For a more detailed discussion and formal analysis of the ways in which members may be characterized by properties of the collectivities to which they belong, and collectivities by the properties of their members, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relations Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni, ed., Complex Organizations (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961).

In trying to explain why some colleges have more cheating than others, we can take account of the makeup of the student body, and in trying to determine why some students cheat and others do not, we can examine the context provided by the college they attend. Thus, we can provide a more holistic or comprehensive picture of the sources of academic dishonesty.

Second, the design also permits us to bring together data from several different sources in the analysis of the same problem. We can use data from deans, student body presidents, and students alternatively or simultaneously to account for a finding. Each source of data may provide more complete or more reliable information on some aspect of the phenomenon under study than either of the other two, and data not available in one source may be found in another.

Furthermore, having data from various sources provides perspective on the problem under investigation; for example, it allows us to compare the viewpoints of people differentially located in the same social structure. We can compare their estimates of the amount of academic dishonesty at their colleges to see whether their perceptions are consistent. It even becomes possible to evaluate the accuracy and reliability of the information each source provides. In some cases, we can compare the perceptions of the three groups with the reality as we measure it.

The design therefore permits us to select the data best suited for a particular analysis and to replicate findings with the data from different sources. These advantages of the research design should permit a more precise and detailed explanation of academic dishonesty. Needless to say, we have not taken full advantage of the more complex modes of analysis in this first report of our findings. But we have referred to the advantages of the research design to alert the reader to some of the kinds of analysis he can expect to encounter in subsequent chapters.

Organization of the Report

A brief description of how the report is organized may serve as a guide to the reader. The next three chapters describe in detail the problem of academic dishonesty as it exists on American college campuses. In Chapter 2 we look at the problem from the viewpoint of deans and student body presidents; we see how serious they think it is and how it is handled relative to other forms of student misconduct. Chapters 3 and 4 describe the behavior itself--where it occurs, how much goes on, and what forms are most prevalent. Chapter 3 is devoted to the kinds of courses in which students encounter academic dishonesty. Chapter 4 turns to students' reports about their own cheating behavior. These data are examined in some detail in order to arrive at a measure of academic dishonesty for the individual student.

The next four chapters (Chapters 5 through 8) focus on the students who cheat. Here we try to find out why some students cheat and others do not. We examine the student's personal commitments and values and the pressures he faces because of his own abilities and the expectations others have of him. Chapter 5 deals with adaptations to the student role--students' efforts and performances in the academic sphere of college. Chapter 6 examines more general aspects of their orientation to college--why they are in college and what they expect to get out of it. In Chapter 7, we go back to the high school experiences of these students to see whether their adaptations and orientations to college (the subjects of the two previous chapters) began to develop in this earlier phase of the educational sequence. In Chapter 8 we turn to the students' social surroundings on the college campus to see how their peers and the attitudes held by their peers toward academic dishonesty influence their cheating behavior.

In the next two chapters (Chapters 9 and 10), the analysis shifts from the individual student to the college. Here we try to find out why some colleges have a high level of cheating and others do not. Chapter 9 takes up general institutional characteristics associated the level of cheating and attempts to account for their effect. Chapter 10 deals with specific institutional arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty and tries to evaluate the effectiveness of various approaches.

Chapter 11, the concluding chapter, summarizes the major findings and attempts to evaluate their implications for dealing more effectively with the problem of academic dishonesty on college campuses. It also calls attention to questions not dealt with in the present report and indicates how the data now available can be used in subsequent analysis to answer them. But before discussing what more needs to be done let us turn to the findings we can now present.

Chapter 2

THE PROBLEM OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN CONTEXT

To understand academic dishonesty as a problem of student misconduct on the American college campus, we must try to see it in perspective--in the context of other forms of deviance among college students. What are the most serious student disciplinary problems? How many students come to the attention of authorities for various forms of misconduct? Where does responsibility lie for deciding upon disciplinary measures in different types of cases? And, what disciplinary action is usually taken for various offenses?

We shall rely on the deans of students and the student body presidents for answers to these questions. At many colleges, they play an active part in dealing with problems of student misconduct, and at nearly all schools, they are at least indirectly concerned with such problems. The extent to which their answers agree will be of interest, and using data from both these sources should provide a good picture of academic dishonesty in the context of other student disciplinary problems. Let us begin by seeing what disciplinary problems are regarded as most serious.

Seriousness of the Problem

To get a picture of the kinds of student misconduct they consider most serious, we asked each dean and student body president in our sample to: "Mention what you consider the most serious problem of student discipline at your college." As Table 2.1 shows, most respondents mentioned a specific offense or form of misconduct, some cited general disciplinary problems, others said they had no serious disciplinary problems or gave no answer.

TABLE 2.1

Most Serious Problem of Student Discipline

	Deans		SBP[a]	
Specific Kinds of Offenses	53%		43%	
Drinking, partying, and disorderly conduct[b]		50%		48%
Academic dishonesty		23		29
Sex misconduct and sex-related social misconduct		12		8
Theft, shoplifting		10		8
Destruction of or damage to property		5		7
		100% (334)		100% (216)
General Disciplinary Problems	24		36	
(Not living up to standards of conduct, breaking school rules and regulations, weak morals or poor attitudes, etc.)				
No Serious Problems or No Answer	23		21	
	100% (626)		100% (502)	

---

[a] SBP = Student Body Presidents.

[b] Of the respondents in this category, 90 per cent of the deans and 89 per cent of the student body presidents mentioned drinking, drunkeness, or some form of drinking-related behavior.

Among the specific forms of misconduct mentioned as most serious, drinking, partying, and associated misconduct were cited most often. Academic dishonesty, including cheating on tests and exams and plagiarizing on papers and assignments, ranked second. Sex misconduct or sex-related social misconduct ranked third, theft and shoplifting ranked fourth, and destruction of or damage to property ranked fifth. This rank order, with the exception of one tie, holds in both the data from deans and that from student body presidents.

Undoubtedly, a number of factors contribute to the judgment that a particular form of misconduct constitutes a serious disciplinary problem. If it violates norms strongly supported by campus sentiment, if it is deemed prevalent or widespread, or if it becomes publicly embarrassing, it is apt to take on the dimensions of a serious disciplinary problem. In particular, as more students come to their attention for a given form of misconduct, we might expect the authorities to feel that it constitutes a serious disciplinary problem.

Deans and student body presidents were asked to indicate the average number of students who were brought to the attention of authorities since the beginning of the school year (a period of about eight months) for various kinds of misconduct. The offenses we listed in this question, as shown in Table 2.2 are similar to those mentioned in response to the open-ended question about the most serious problem of student discipline.

Generally speaking, the more often students are brought to the attention of authorities for a particular offense, the more often is the offense cited as the most serious one. Academic dishonesty ranks second to a broad class of social misbehavior both in terms of

TABLE 2.2

Median Number of Students Brought to the Attention of Authorities During an Eight-Month Period for Each Kind of Offense

Kind of Offense	Deans (Median No. of students)	Deans (No. of deans)	SBP (Median No. of students)	SBP (No. of SBP)
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior	7	(561)	10	(369)
Cheating and plagiarism	3	(539)	4	(359)
Destruction of property	3	(546)	3	(348)
Theft	2	(556)	2	(353)
Sex misconduct	1	(550)	0	(342)

seriousness and in the number of students brought to the attention of authorities. Less often cited as the most serious student disciplinary problem and less often brought to the attention of authorities are cases involving sex misconduct, theft, or destruction of property.[1]

It is noteworthy that the number of students brought to the attention of authorities for cheating and plagiarism is quite small. At the rate of three or four students per semester, this amounts to less than 1 per cent of the student body per year at the average-sized school.[2] Of course, deans and student body presidents would acknowledge that not all students who cheat or plagiarize come to the attention of authorities--some students cheat and get away with it.

---

[1] Slight differences in the ordering of offenses between Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 may be due to the failure of the categories of offenses in the two tables to coincide exactly. For instance, "sex misconduct and sex-related social misconduct" in Table 2.1 includes behavior that violates rules about dating, visits by the opposite sex in dormitory rooms, public show of affection, and other forms of behavior that respondents have included under the rubric of "disorderly conduct or improper social behavior in Table 2.2. On the other hand, some offenses coded as "drinking, partying, and disorderly conduct" in Table 2.1 may have been included under "destruction of property" in Table 2.2 since no category was provided in that table specifically for drinking or drinking-associated misconduct, and since at least one of the consequences of drinking and partying is the damage and destruction of property.

To find out how widespread cheating and plagiarism are thought to be, we asked deans and student body presidents to give a rough estimate of the percentage of the students at their college who cheat or plagiarize. As shown in Table 2.3, deans, on the average, estimate that 15 per cent of the student body chear or plagiarize, and student body presidents estimate 20 per cent. The difference between the distribution of estimates of the two groups is most strongly reflected in the category "40% or more."

TABLE 2.3

Deans' and Student Body Presidents' Estimates of the Proportion of Students of Their Campus Who Cheat or Plagiarize

Estimates	Deans (%)	SBP (%)
0 - 9%	33	27
10%-19%	23	20
20%-29%	20	16
30%-39%	16	19
40% or more	8	18
	100% (523)	100% (474)
Median estimate	15%	20%

As official representatives of their colleges, deans may feel somewhat more reluctant than student body presidents to give a high estimate. Also, the student body presidents may have first-hand experience with cheating and plagiarism. They may base their estimates on what they observe or hear about instances of academic dishonesty in their courses or elsewhere on the campus, information that does not come to the attention of the deans.

---

[2] The median-sized school in the sample has about a thousand students.

At any rate, the estimates of both deans and student body presidents, in conjunction with their reports of the number of students brought to the attention of authorities for this offense, suggest that only a small fraction of the students who cheat or plagiarize come to the attention of authorities.[3] But what about those who are caught? Who decides upon disciplinary action and what disciplinary measures are taken? How does the way academic dishonesty is handled compare with the way other forms of misconduct are dealt with?

Modes of Handling the Problem

We asked deans and student body presidents to indicate what individual or group usually decides upon disciplinary measures for each of five kinds of campus offenses. They could choose one of the six following answers for each kind of offense: an individual from the faculty; an individual from the administration; an individual from the student body; a group composed mostly of faculty; a group composed mostly of administrators; a group composed mostly of students. These data appear in Table 2.4.

---

[3] Of course, the deans' and students body presidents' estimates of how much academic dishonesty goes on may well be inaccurate, and, if so, they may be underestimating the seriousness of the problem.

TABLE 2.4

Individual or Group Who Usually Decides Upon Disciplinary Measures For Each Type of Offense

Type of Offense	Deans		SBP	
	Individuals from (%)	Group of mostly (%)	Individuals from (%)	Group of mostly (%)
Sex misconduct				
Administration	42	33	43	32
Student Body	a	8	3	11
Faculty	1	16	2	9
Destruction of Property				
Administration	44	30	44	30
Student Body	1	13	3	16
Faculty	1	11	1	6
Theft				
Administration	36	27	44	26
Student Body	2	17	2	19
Faculty	1	17	1	8
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior				
Administration	27	25	28	22
Student Body	2	30	7	34
Faculty	1	15	1	8
Cheating and Plagiarism				
Administration	14	10	13	11
Student Body	2	13	3	22
Faculty	31	25	38	13

---

[a] Less than 1 per cent.

The five kinds of offenses are ordered according to the frequency with which administrators usually decide upon disciplinary measures. Sex misconduct, destruction of property, and theft, the first three offenses in the table, show very similar patterns in this respect. For all of these, administrators usually make disciplinary decisions at a majority of the schools, and it is more often administrators acting as individuals than as members of committees or groups who make the decisions.

The pattern for handling disorderly conduct or improper social behavior is a little different. In these cases, administrators still make decisions in more schools than do students or faculty, but the most common disciplining agency is not an individual administrator, as it is in the previous kinds of offenses, but, instead, a group composed mostly of students.

With cheating and plagiarism, the pattern changes abruptly. Here it is the faculty members who, in over half of the colleges, usually decide on disciplinary measures. Moreover, it is the individual faculty member--presumably the instructor in whose course the incident occurs--who usually makes the decisions, rather than groups of faculty members. Faculty groups, along with groups composed mainly of students, are the two next most common disciplinary agencies. (Discrepancies between the reports of deans and student body presidents make it impossible to say which ranks second and which third.) Administrators acting individually come fourth; groups composed mostly of administrators, fifth; and individual students, sixth.

In short, for most kinds of student misconduct at most schools, the administration plays the predominant role in deciding on disciplinary measures. When it comes to cases of academic dishonesty, however, disciplinary action in a majority of the schools falls into the hands of the faculty. The fact that individual faculty members usually handle academic dishonesty cases at most schools may explain why deans and student body presidents report that only a very few students come to the attention of authorities for cheating and plagiarism. Faculty members may actually encounter and take disciplinary action in a number of cases with deans and student body presidents knowing about it.

How do the disciplinary actions taken in cases of academic dishonesty compare with those imposed for other offenses? Several specific types of misconduct were listed in the questionnaire, and deans and student body presidents were asked to identify the penalty that comes closest to the one usually imposed on their campus for each of the offenses. Table 2.5 shows the per cent saying that students are usually suspended or expelled at their college for each offense.

TABLE 2.5

Per Cent of Respondents Reporting that Students Are Usually Suspended or Expelled for Each Kind of Offense

Kind of Offense	Deans (%)	SBP (%)
Stealing possessions or money from other students	83 (561)	79 (441)
Violating rules about having guests of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms	71 (525)	68 (424)
Being drunk and disorderly	66 (543)	54 (463)
Stealing books from the library	52 (541)	34 (434)
Cheating on a final exam	18 (587)	24 (482)
Cheating on a midterm exam	14 (583)	18 (474)
Plagiarizing on a term paper	10 (583)	13 (468)

The three most severely sanctioned offenses are instances of theft, sex misconduct, and disorderly conduct. For each of these offenses students are usually suspended or expelled at over half the schools. The three offenses sanctioned most leniently, on the other hand, are all forms of academic dishonesty. Fewer than a quarter of the colleges in our sample usually suspend or expel students for plagiarizing on a term paper, cheating on a midterm exam, or cheating on a final exam.

We have seen that academic dishonesty constitutes a serious problem of student discipline; it ranks second behind disorderly conduct and improper social behavior both in terms of seriousness as a disciplinary problem and in terms of the number of students brought to the attention of authorities. Yet, the most severe sanctions--suspension and expulsion from school--are seldom brought to bear for this form of misconduct. Perhaps this reflects the fact that, unlike the more severely punished offenses, which also violate legal norms in the larger society, cheating and plagiarism are forms of unethical behavior restricted to the academic community. Perhaps it reflects the belief that cheating is self-destructive, that the student who cheats will suffer severe enough consequences, such as failing in his schoolwork.

We have seen that, contrary to the pattern of handling other kinds of offenses, academic dishonesty is handled primarily by faculty members acting individually. This undoubtedly stems from the fact that it is the individual instructor who usually detects the act of cheating. Unlike the other offenses, academic dishonesty is apt to involve only the cheating student and his instructor. The faculty member may well believe that he can make the student who has cheated see the errors of his ways without severe punishment. Furthermore, suspending or expelling a student is generally not directly a perogative of the faculty member. To have such punishments imposed, he would have to review the case with the dean or some other authority and thereby involve himself in red tape and run the risk of having his recommendation rejected. These considerations suggest that the instructor might resort to the limited sanctions available to him, such as failing the student in the course or failing him on the piece of work on which he has cheated. To be sure, norms about handling such cases on his campus will affect the faculty member's decision about what disciplinary measures to use.

Whatever the reason, relative to other disciplinary problems, academic dishonesty presents a paradox: campus authorities consider it to be one of the more serious disciplinary problems and yet sanctions against it are considerably more lenient than those imposed on other forms of student misconduct. One obvious implication is that the leniency with which academic dishonesty is treated on many campuses may account, at least in part, for its seriousness as a student disciplinary problem.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Chapter 3

THE SETTING IN WHICH ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OCCURS

As background for our subsequent analysis of the kinds of students who engage in academic dishonesty, we shall now look at the setting of cheating--the kinds of courses in which cheating takes place. Courses vary in many ways--in the type of material they cover, the way in which they are taught, the frequency and kinds of exams they have, and size of classes, to mention just a few. These attributes of courses provide varying opportunities, temptations, and pressures for academic dishonesty. We already know what college administrators think about academic dishonesty and how they deal with it. We shall now try to find out how methods of instruction and ways of organizing course work at their schools relate to cheating.

In carrying out this analysis, we shall treat the course itself as the unit under study, using the reports given by students to characterize it. Students were asked to give information on the courses they took "last term," and since they reported on an average of about four courses each, we have a sample of courses about four times as large as the sample of students.[1]

---

[1] The exact number of courses reported on is 24,691. We shall proceed on the assumption that these are all different courses. In fact, however, some students from the same school could easily be reporting about the same course and so the true count of separate courses is somewhat lower than this figure. Since the sample of students in the same year at any one school is relatively small, this multiple reporting cannot be too frequent and should not introduce any serious bias in the analysis. In short, we shall talk about 24,691 courses as if they are all different, when, strictly speaking, not all of them are.

Among the questions about the courses taken last term were some dealing with academic dishonesty. The students were asked whether they knew about or had learned about any other students cheating on the final exam, any other students cheating on tests other than the final, or any other students cheating on homework or lab assignments. The distribution of courses on the basis of students' responses to these three items are presented in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1

Per Cent of Courses in Which Various Types of Cheating Occur

	% of courses with cheating	
The final exam	8	(24,056)
Tests other than the final	12	(24,194)
Homework or lab assignments	13	(24,047)
One or more kinds of academic work	22	(23,117)

As can be seen from the table, cheating on the final exam was observed by students in eight per cent of the aggregate of courses they took last term. The figure is somewhat higher for homework and lab assignments and for tests other than finals. The fourth entry in the table shows that in some 22 per cent of the courses one or another of these forms of cheating occurred. The true rate is undoubtedly higher, since not all incidents of cheating are observed by others. Nonetheless, we shall contrast the courses in which cheating was known to have occurred with the others to find out what attributes of courses make them prone to cheating incidents. If a student indicates that he knows about or has learned about any of these three types of cheating in a given course, that course is classified as one in which academic dishonesty occurred; otherwise, the course is considered free of academic dishonesty.

We shall first examine some general characteristics of courses as they relate to academic dishonesty and then look at factors specific to the test or exam situation.

General Characteristics of Courses and Academic Dishonesty

Students characterized the courses they took last term according to level of offering (introductory versus advanced), teaching method (seminar or discussion versus lecture), and type of study materials (various outside readings versus textbook only). These three attributes, when considered together, suggest an underlying dimension of "quality" in the sense that a course that covers more complex and sophisticated subject matter (advanced rather than elementary), uses a broader range of sources (outside readings rather than textbook only), and encourages a free flow of discussion and exchange of ideas (seminar or discussion rather than lecture) is a higher quality course than one that lacks these features.

We have seen that cheating was observed in 22 per cent of the courses the students had taken in the previous term. As we might expect, this proportion varies considerably with these measures of course quality. As Table 3.2 shows, academic dishonesty is more likely to occur in introductory courses, in those taught by the lecture method, and in those relying on textbooks.

TABLE 3.2

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs, by Various Indicators of Course Quality

Characteristic of Course	% of courses with cheating	
Advanced	20	(12,683)
Elementary	27	(9,982)
Seminar or discussion	16	(4,497)
Lecture	24	(18,596)
Outside readings	18	(5,638)
Textbook only	24	(17,460)

Perhaps the higher quality courses have less cheating because they attract the better students, those who have less need to cheat. But other factors contribute to the likelihood of cheating in a course apart from its quality. In fact, some of the indicators of quality have other implicit dimensions that also relate to cheating. For example, courses taught by seminar or discussion methods are apt to be small in size, as are the advanced courses. Large classes might well provide more opportunity for cheating than small classes, independent of quality. Similarly, the opportunity to cheat should increase with the number of tests that are given in the course. Table 3.3 shows that both size of classes and frequency of examinations are indeed related to cheating.

The greater likelihood of cheating in large classes is not surprising in that the students in such a class are less visible to the instructor. The instructor simply has more students to watch during a test or exam and therefore cannot keep as close an eye on any

TABLE 3.3

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Size of Class and Number of Scheduled Tests Given

	% of courses with cheating	
Size of Class		
Less than 20	15	(7,012)
20-30	21	(6,375)
More than 30	31	(9,684)
"Three or more scheduled tests other than the final"[a]		
Yes	31	(12,552)
No	15	(11,064)

---

[a] The students were asked to check if the course had three or more scheduled exams. They were not asked to list the number of scheduled tests.

---

particular student. A student, for his part, is more apt to feel anonymous in the large class and think he has a greater chance of getting away with cheating. But we must not overlook the fact that the relationship between size and cheating is in part an artifact of our method of classifying courses. Our measure of cheating is not based on a rate (the proportion of cheaters in the class), but simply the occurrence of an act of cheating in the course. Given that some students are more prone to cheat than others, the more students in a class, the more likely it is that one of them will be a cheater. In short, size of class probably indicates both opportunity to cheat and the presence of those predisposed toward this form of behavior.

Courses having frequent scheduled tests turn out to have twice as high a cheating rate as courses with fewer scheduled tests, indicating that the more chances provided for cheating, the more likely it is that those prone to cheat will take advantage of the opportunity.

Apart from the opportunity to cheat provided by some courses, there are characteristics of courses that increase the pressure on students to engage in academic dishonesty. One of these is the system of grading used. In many college courses, instructors do not apply absolute standards. Instead, they mark on "the curve," meaning that grades are distributed among students on the basis of their performance relative to one another. This system of grading emphasizes competition among students, which, in turn, is apt to raise students' anxieties. Just as grading on the curve is apt to increase anxiety, so, we might expect, would unscheduled tests or quizzes. Students may feel that an unscheduled test has caught them ill-prepared and that they will get a worse grade than they really deserve. Some students may even feel that the instructor is not justified in testing them without advance notice, and they may therefore feel less compelled to "play fair." In any case, Table 3.4 shows that the rate of cheating does increase when the instructor marks on a curve or gives unscheduled tests.

TABLE 3.4

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs, by
Grading System and Use of Unscheduled Tests

	% of courses with cheating	
The instructor marked on the "curve"		
Yes	30	(8,081)
No	20	(15,031)
Unscheduled tests or quizzes were given		
Yes	31	(5,214)
No	21	(17,409)

The amount of time and effort a course requires and how much it counts toward the students' overall grade averages may also act as pressures toward cheating. At most colleges, courses are assigned "credit points" or "credit hours" according to the amount of time and effort they are supposed to require. Most are three-credit courses, but those with longer classes or with lab sessions as well as lectures are usually worth four or more credits. On the other hand, there are courses with light workloads that permit students to earn only one or two points of credit. At most schools, the number of credits a course carries also affects its weight in the students' cumulative grade averages. For instance, an "A" in a four-credit course may count the same as "As" in two courses worth two credits each. Thus, students may feel more pressure to cheat in courses with more credits. Table 3.5 shows that, as points of credit increase, courses are more likely to have cheating incidents reported in them.

TABLE 3.5

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs, by Number of Credits Offered

	% of courses with cheating	
One or two credits	18	(3,592)
Three credits	22	(14,615)
Four or more credits	34	(4,729)

Points of credit may reflect factors other than pressure to cheat. At most colleges, students are required to take courses that many of them would avoid if the choice were left up to them. These include basic courses in the natural sciences, such as physics and chemistry, which are usually worth four or more points, and we have already seen that introductory courses are more likely to have incidents of cheating than advanced ones. Also, courses providing more points of credit may provide more opportunity to cheat. The more work there is to do for a course, the more opportunities for cheating are available. Nevertheless, there appear to be pressures toward academic dishonesty as a result of the time and effort a course requires and the extent to which it may affect the students' academic standings.

The Testing Situation

If the opportunities and pressures for cheating vary with general characteristics such as size, time and effort required, and system of grading, we can expect that cheating will certainly be linked to specific characteristics of the tests used and the circumstances surrounding their administration.

Obviously, some types of tests and examinations provide more opportunity for cheating than others. When students are required to give short answers or merely make check marks on multiple choice or true/false items, they should find it easier to copy from one another or to use cribnotes for reference than when they are presented with essay questions. That this is true can be seen in Table 3.6.

Still another aspect of the testing procedure that bears on academic dishonesty is the uniqueness of the exam given In some college courses tests and exams are prepared for each individual class and only for that class; in others, they are designed to be given to two or more classes or sections that meet at different times. Moreover, in some instances the same exam is given in different years. Table 3.7 shows how these conditions affect the likelihood of dishonesty in the course.

TABLE 3.6

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Types of Questions Asked on Tests or Exams

	% of courses with cheating	
True/false, multiple-choice, or matching questions were asked on tests or exams		
Yes	31	(8,690)
No	19	(14,309)
Short written answer or problem-solving questions were asked on tests or exams		
Yes	28	(12,848)
No	18	(10,387)
Essay questions were asked on tests or exams		
Yes	19	(12,337)
No	28	(11,150)

TABLE 3.7

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Kinds of Testing Practices

	% of courses with cheating	
The same test or exam was given over again to later classes		
Yes	32	(4,489)
No	21	(18,841)
The same test or exam had been given in previous years		
Yes	38	(1,820)
No	21	(20,695)

As can be seen from the table, cheating occurs more often when the same test is given to more than one class and, in particular, when the same test has been given in previous years.

One further aspect of the testing situation remains to be examined: the role of the instructor during the exam. One might expect that an instructor who proctors closely and who exerts strict discipline over students during tests and exams would have less cheating in his courses. The data, however, suggest that the contrary is true. This can be seen from Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8

Per Cent of Courses in Which Cheating Occurs by Various Indicators of Classroom Discipline During Tests and Exams

	% of courses with cheating	
Students were watched closely during tests or exams		
Yes	36	(6,843)
No	18	(16,517)
Seating was staggered during tests or exams		
Yes	28	(9,332)
No	20	(13,107)
Students sat in assigned seats during tests or exams		
Yes	30	(6,046)
No	21	(17,039)
Students were not allowed to leave their seats without special permission during tests or exams		
Yes	26	(13,065)
No	18	(10,049)
Students were not allowed to leave the room without special permission during tests or exams		
Yes	26	(14,715)
No	16	(8,258)

The first item in Table 3.8 indicates that courses in which students are watched closely during tests and exams are twice as likely to have had instances of academic dishonesty as those in which they are not. Furthermore, the other four items in the table indicate that cheating is more likely to occur when rules and regulations governing the taking of tests and exams are stricter. Thus, when seating is staggered, when students sit in assigned seats, and when they are not allowed to leave either their seats or the room without special permission, cheating is more prevalent. The apparent paradox posed by these findings tends to be resolved when we remember that strict rules during exams are more characteristic of large courses, courses using standardized examination procedures. In short, close proctoring and stricter procedures are probably responses to the tendencies to cheat we have already seen. They may well have the effect of reducing the level of academic dishonesty from what it might otherwise be. Also relevant here is the presence or absence of an honor system in the college, a topic we shall investigate later on. Close proctoring by faculty occurs, of course, where honor systems do not exist, and, as we shall see in a later chapter, tend to reduce the level of academic dishonesty at a college. It may well be, then, that students interpret close proctoring and strict rules as meaning that they have less of a moral responsibility to play by the rules of the game. Whatever internal restraints they may have against this form of behavior may be weakened in the situation where fear of being caught is made the chief motive for not cheating.

The findings in this chapter point to some of the conditions underlying the occurrence of academic dishonesty. On the one hand, there are factors such as class size, frequency of testing, and kinds of questions asked that seem to affect the opportunity students have to cheat in a course. On the other hand, there are time and work requirements, competitive grading, and scheduling of tests and exams that represent pressures on students to engage in academic dishonesty. Some testing practices, such as administering tests under strict discipline and giving unannounced tests and quizzes, may have the effect of provoking students into academic dishonesty. The students may feel that these testing procedures are unfair and that they in turn are not obliged to "play fair."

Although the nature of the college and its facilities set limits on the alterations that can be made in the organization of courses and the methods of instruction, the faculty and administration can exercise control over some of the aspects of courses we have examined in this chapter. Some practices, such as the use of standardized tests and the re-use of examinations, probably have evolved in response to the increasing enrollment in American colleges. But students seem to regard such short-cut methods as an invitation to academic dishonesty given them by the teachers who employ these methods. If colleges are to succeed in instilling norms of academic integrity in their students, they might begin by revising examination procedures and, so, removing temptations from the paths of their students.

Chapter 4

MEASURES OF CHEATING

In this chapter we shall examine students' responses to questions concerning the cheating of others and their own cheating behavior. We shall show the kinds of cheating that are most frequent on college campuses and the proportion of students who admit to various kinds of cheating and, finally, we shall arrive at a method of classifying students according to whether they are cheaters.

Before considering the data on students' own cheating behavior, we shall first look at their perceptions of the cheating of their fellow students. Not only will their encounters with the academic dishonesty of others give us some notion of how prevalent cheating is; even more importantly, these data will provide us with a way of checking on the students' reports of their own cheating. Respondents are usually ready to tell about their own behavior, but when the behavior in question is socially undesirable or disapproved, they may be reluctant to give a full true account even though they are assured of complete anonymity. The tendency to distort presumably is not as strong when it comes to reporting the deviant behavior of others. If we find that many students have observed others cheating, but that hardly any admit to cheating themselves, then we would have good grounds for suspecting the validity of students' reports of their own behavior. If, on the other hand, the proportion of admitted cheaters is close to the rate of perceived cheating or even exceeds it, then we can have much more confidence in the accuracy of students' reports of their own cheating.[1]

Students' Experiences with the Cheating of Others

At one point students were asked how often since coming to college they had seen another student cheating during a test or exam and how often another student had asked them for help on a test or exam. Their responses to these two questions are presented in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1

Per Cent of Students Who Have Seen Others Cheating and Who Have Been Asked for Help by Others on Tests Or Exams Since Coming to College

	Saw another student cheating during a test or exam	Was asked for help during a test or exam
Never	46%	60%
Once	10	7
A few times	29	26
Several or many times	15	7
	100% (5,385)	100% (5,390)

More than half the students have observed others cheating on tests or exams, and two out of five have actually been approached by students who wanted help. Moreover, the greatest proportion of those who have seen others cheating and who have been asked for help indicate that this happened more than once. Since the proportion who have been asked for help is almost as great as the proportion who have seen others cheat, we can conclude that much of the cheating that goes on during tests or exams involves more than one student. Those who engage in this kind of academic dishonesty tend to implicate others by seeking their cooperation.

---

[1] This reasoning assumes that there is little overlap in students' reports of the cheating of others. It is conceivable that a few cheaters would be observed by most students on their campus. If this were the case, the rate of self-reported cheating would be much lower than the perceived rate. But since these students are in different years at different colleges, and since even within the same year at the same college students are apt to be in different courses, this possibility is most unlikely It makes more sense to assume that there is little overlap in the cheaters that are being observed.

In addition to the cheating they may have encountered since coming to college, we asked students about cheating in the courses they had taken in the previous term, a shorter and more recent time period (for all except freshmen). It was this question that allowed us to examine the kinds of courses in which cheating occurs. We now use the same data to characterize students instead of courses. Students were asked about cheating in three situations: the final exam, other tests, and homework or lab assignments. The results appear in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

Per Cent of Students Who Encountered Other Students Cheating on Various Types of Work in Last-Term Courses

	They encountered other students cheating on			
Number of courses last term	The final	Other tests	Homework or lab assignments	Any of the three types of work
None	76%	67%	62%	49%
One	13	18	22	25
Two	7	9	9	14
Three or more	4	6	7	12
	100% (4936)	100% (4964)	100% (4,933)	100% (4,798)

As can be seen from the last column, half the students were aware of some form of cheating in at least one of the courses they had taken in the previous term. More than a quarter of the students observed cheating in at least two of their courses. Interestingly enough, students were most likely to know about cheating that took place outside the classroom; that is, cheating on homework and lab assignments. Since the observability of this form of cheating is not as great as cheating in the classroom, we might suppose that the true rate of such cheating is even higher than these data indicate.

We now know that many college students--more than half--have come in contact with one or another form of cheating among their classmates. They report encounters with cheating both inside and outside the classroom, and many of them say they were approached by other students trying to involve them in a cheating incident. Thus, academic dishonesty is not only widespread, but knowledge of it appears to be quite public. The student who cheats is not apt to think he is alone, at least on most campuses. Moreover, his knowledge of cheating among other students probably forms the basis for his judgment about how many students at his college engage in academic dishonesty.

As we did with deans and student body presidents, we asked students to estimate roughly the percentage of the student body at their college who have cheated or plagiarized. For comparative purposes, we repeat the estimates of deans and student body presidents, which were presented earlier in Table 2.3.

The data show that students' estimates of the proportion of cheaters exceeds those of both deans and student body presidents. The median estimate for the students is 25 per cent; for student body presidents,

TABLE 4.3

Students' Estimates of the Per Cent of Students on Their Campuses Who Cheat or Plagiarize, Compared with Estimates of Deans and Student Body Presidents

Estimates	Students	Student Body Presidents	Deans
0-9%	25%	27%	33%
10%-19%	17	20	23
20%-29%	15	16	20
30%-39%	9	19	16
40% or more	34	18	18
	100% (4,889)	100% (474)	100% (523)
Median Percentage Estimate:[a]	25%	20%	15%

[a] Since the 99 schools from which students were sampled are like those represented by deans and student body presidents (as shown in Appendix C) comparisons among these estimates seem justified.

it is 20 per cent; and for deans, who presumably are furthest removed from the incidents of academic dishonesty, the median estimate is 15 per cent. Moreover, students are quite a bit more likely to give a high estimate--to say that 40 per cent or more of their fellows cheat. More than a third of them are of this opinion, compared with less than a fifth of the student body presidents and less than a tenth of the deans. The students, then, who are perhaps in the best position to know, believe more students are involved in academic dishonesty than do deans or student body presidents.

Having seen how much cheating students think there is on campus, let us now see how much cheating there is according to students' reports about their own academic dishonesty.

Students' Reports on Their Own Cheating Behavior

In three successive questions, respondents were asked about cheating that they might have engaged in while at college (see Appendix G, Q. 58, Q. 59, and Q. 60). The first of these asked students to indicate how often since coming to college they had engaged in each of four forms of academic dishonesty. The second listed 13 specific acts that most people would agree represent cheating, and asked the student to check all those that he had commited in college. The third question asked the students to provide certain information about recent cheating incidents (if any) in which they had been involved. This one differs from the other two in that the definition of what constitutes cheating was left up to the student and the word "cheating" itself was used for the first time. We shall consider the students' responses to these three questions in the order in which they were asked.

Four Forms of Academic Dishonesty. Students first encountered questions about their own cheating in a battery of items that dealt with other aspects of their behavior as well. The last four items in the battery asked them to indicate how often they engaged in various forms of cheating. The four items and students' responses to them are presented in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4

Per Cent of Students Admitting Having Engaged in Various Forms of Cheating Since Coming to College

How often since you have been in college have you:	Never	Once	A few times	Several or many times	
Copied from another student during an exam	71	13	15	1	100% (5,320)
Plagiarized from published materials on papers	72	9	16	3	100% (5,312)
Turned in papers done entirely or in part by other students	86	7	6	1	100% (5,318)
Used crib notes during an exam	87	6	6	1	100% (5,321)

More than a quarter of the students in the sample report having copied from another student during an exam, and virtually as many say they have plagiarized from published materials. Among those who engaged in these acts, the majority did so more than once. A smaller proportion, 14 per cent, say that they submitted as their own a paper written by another student, and a similar number, 13 per cent, admit to having used crib notes during an exam. Respondents admitting to these two kinds of cheating are about equally split between those who engaged in them once and those who engaged in them a few times.

It may be noted that, at least in terms of these four items, cheating on exams (items one and four) is just about as prevalent as cheating on papers (items two and three), and that cheating that implies collusion with others (items one and three) occurs about as often as cheating that does not imply access to other students (items two and four). Cheating on exams more often involves others (item one compared with item four); cheating on papers is more apt to be a solo activity (item two compared with item four).

We cannot tell from Table 4.4 the proportion of students who report at least one of these forms of academic dishonesty. Table 4.5, in which students are classified according to the number of these forms of cheating they have engaged in, provides this information.

TABLE 4.5

Number of Different Forms of Cheating in Which Students Have Engaged

Number of different forms of cheating	% who have engaged in each number
None	50%
One	27
Two	14
Three	6
Four	3
	100%
	(5,280)

These data show that half the students have engaged in one or more of these forms of academic dishonesty; they are divided about equally between those who have "specialized" in only one kind of cheating and those who have engaged in at least two kinds of academic dishonesty. In other words, one out of every two students has cheated. Of those who have, almost one out of two has engaged in more than one kind of cheating.

It should be noted that many more students admit cheating than students themselves think. The proportion of self-admitted cheaters is twice as great as the median estimate of students would indicate. (See Table 4.3. The percentage is also two and a half times the median estimate of student body presidents and more than three times the median estimate of deans.) In spite of the widespread knowledge of cheating, then, students still tend to underestimate the true amount. Cheating would seem to be a pattern of behavior characterized by what Floyd Allport has called "pluralistic ignorance";[2] that is, behavior that is more prevalent than the people who engage in it think. Many more students engage in this deviant behavior than is commonly known.

It is difficult to estimate from Tables 4.4 and 4.5 how much cheating occurs per student. We know that among those engaging in each form of cheating, there are at least as many "repeaters" as "one-time offenders." In fact, for the two most prevalent forms of cheating, a majority of the cheaters have done so at least a few times. We also know that nearly half of those who admit ever having cheated in these ways have engaged in two or more different kinds of cheating. By definition, they have been involved in at least two cheating incidents, and many of them have been involved in more. The evidence would suggest that the typical cheater is someone who has engaged in this form of deviant behavior at least a few times.[3]

---

[2] Floyd H. Allport, Social Psychology, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924).

[3] It is not possible to get a precise count of the number of instances of cheating represented by these four items because the response categories of "a few times," "several times," and "many times" are indefinite. A very crude estimate can be arrived at by giving numerical interpretations to these qualitative terms. Assuming that "a few times," on the average refers to three incidents; "several times," on the average, to six incidents; and "many times," to nine, then summing the weighted frequencies on all four items gives us a total of 10,818 instances of academic dishonesty. This amounts to about two instances of cheating per student or four instances per student who cheats. (It is worth noting that our estimate of the number of incidents is affected primarily by the weight we give to the category "a few times," since most students who report having cheated more than once give this response.) But our estimate depends not only on the numerical weights assigned, but also on which of the questions dealing with cheating we use. As we shall soon see, different estimates would emerge from the other questions.

Thirteen Specific Acts. The second battery dealing with cheating presented students with thirteen kinds of behavior that might be considered dishonesty in the light of academic standards. Most of them are clearly instances of cheating, but some may fall on the borderline between cheating and tolerated methods of coping with academic requirements. Students were asked to check those that they had committed in college. Table 4.6 presents the number of students reporting each act and what per cent they are of the total sample.

As might be expected, these acts range widely in terms of the percentage of students who engage in them: more than 40 per cent have copied a few sentences of material without citing the source in a paper, whereas fewer than 1 per cent have had another student take an exam for them. Each of the first three items in Table 4.6 is mentioned by more students than any of the four in the previous question and each of the last seven, by fewer than any of the earlier four.

Contrary to the finding from the first set of items, these data suggest that academic dishonesty is more prevalent on papers and assignments than on tests or exams and is more often a solo activity than one involving others. Of the four most prevalent acts, three deal with papers and imply no collusion, and one concerns exams and does involve the cooperation of others. Of the four least prevalent acts, all concern tests or exams and all require cooperation among students to the point of planning and prearrangement. In all, only five of the 13 acts refer to papers or assignments (items 1, 3, 4, 7, and 9), and yet these five account for well over half the acts reported (59 per cent on papers or assignments and 41 per cent on tests or exams). Only four of the acts imply no collusion (items 1, 3, 4, and 6), but these four also account for more than half the acts reported

(58 per cent compared with 42 per cent). The latter finding offers a clue to the tendency toward pluralistic ignorance about cheating. It may well be, as this battery of items suggests, that most cheating occurs in situations of low visibility to others.

TABLE 4.6

Per Cent of Students Admitting Ever Having Committed Each of 13 Specific Acts

Item No.	Specific Acts	% of Sample	Number of Students Admitting Each
1	Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting in a paper	43	2,348
2	Getting Questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam	33	1,769
3	Copying answers from a text or other source instead of doing the work independently	31	1,698
4	"Padding" a few items on a bibliography	28	1,534
5	Giving answers to other students during an exam	17	929
6	Copying from someone's test or exam paper without his knowing about it	16	893
7	Working on the same homework with several other students when the teacher does not allow it	11	622
8	Copying from someone's test or exam paper with that person's knowledge	11	611
9	Writing a paper for another student	9	467
10	Arranging to sit next to someone who will let you copy from him during a test or exam	4	243
11	Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by use of signals	2	106
12	Taking an exam for another student	1	30
13	Having another student take an exam for you	a	12
			11,262 (5,422)

---

[a] This figure represents the total number of instances of academic dishonesty reported in response to these 13 items. Since students could indicate only whether they had ever committed an act, not how often they had done so, the total is far less than the number of such acts actually committed among this sample of students. Even so, the figure amounts to slightly more than two instances of academic dishonesty per student in the sample, or, as we shall see from data in Table 3.7, slightly less than three instances of academic dishonesty per student who has engaged in one or more of them.

What proportion of students are responsible for the behavior reported in response to this question? This can be seen from Table 4.7, which classifies students according to the number of these acts they have committed.

TABLE 4.7

Per Cent of Students Admitting Various Numbers of Acts

Number of acts	% committing each number
None	25%
One	24
Two	19
Three	13
Four	7
Five	5
Six	3
Seven	2
Eight or more	2
	100% (5,422)

On the basis of this battery, we find that fully three-quarters of the students have engaged in at least one act of academic dishonesty; half have committed two or more. This question thus yields an estimate of cheaters half again as large as does the previous battery of items. In fact, just as many have engaged in two or more of these acts as have committed one or more of the kinds of cheating referred to in the earlier question. These data thus tell a somewhat different story. Not only do they suggest that cheating on papers is more prevalent than cheating on exams and that solo cheating is more common than cheating in collusion with others, but they also indicate a much higher proportion of students engaging in some form of academic dishonesty, a proportion so high that it would seem that deviation from standards of academic honesty is almost the "norm" on college campuses.

Before trying to interpret the difference between these two cheating questions let us see what still another question about students' cheating behavior yields.

Self-Defined Cheating; Recent Cheating Incidents. The third question in the series dealing with students' reports of their own cheating refers to recent cheating incidents, and it is the only one in which the word "cheating" occurs. Students were instructed: "If you have cheated since coming to this college, please give the following information for each cheating incident up to three." Students were then asked various questions about the "last incident," the "next to last," and the "incident before that." In all, 4173 cheating incidents were described--three for every four students sampled. Since those who engaged in more than three incidents could only report on the last three, this figure by no means represents a complete accounting of cheating incidents among the sample of students.

For each incident reported, students were asked to indicate, among other things, the kind of work involved and whether there had been collusion with others. Tables 4.8 and 4.9 show how the incidents are distributed on these dimensions. In reading these tables, it is important to keep in mind that incidents of cheating, not students, are being classified. The base figures are thus approximately 4000, not 5422.

TABLE 4.8

Per Cent of Cheating Incidents Occurring on Various Kinds of Work

Kind of work	% of incidents
Final exam	12%
Midterm test or exam	7
Test of quiz other than final or midterm	40
Paper	21
Lab work	16
Other	4
	100% (4,036)

TABLE 4.9

Per Cent of Cheating Incidents in Which Various Methods Were Used

Method	% of incidents
Referring to notes during a test or exam	10%
Submitting published work as one's own	12
Submitting another student's work as one's own	10
Getting answers from another student	40
Giving answers to another student	13
Other	15
	100% (3,984)

Table 4.8 shows that cheating occurs most often on minor tests or quizzes, those other than the final or midterm. When we add to this the cheating that occurs on finals and midterms, we find that cheating on tests of all kinds accounts for 59 per cent of the reported incidents, whereas incidents of cheating on papers and lab assignments make up 39 per cent of the total. This question, then, unlike the previous two, locates classroom cheating as the most frequent type.

As shown in Table 4.9, "getting answers from other students" is the most frequent method of cheating in these reported incidents. When combined with "giving answers to another student" (the same method reported from the perspective of the giver) and "submitting another student's work as one's own," we find that incidents implying collusion with others constitute 63 per cent of the total. In this respect, too, the results of this question give a somewhat different picture than the earlier questions.

How many students can be classified as cheaters according to this question? It turns out that the 4173 cheating incidents were reported by 2121 students, or 39 per cent of the sample. Those who reported incidents tended to cite either one or three, although the mean number per student reporting any is nearly two. This can be seen from Table 4.10.

TABLE 4.10

Per Cent of Students Who Report Various Numbers of Cheating Incidents

Number of incidents	% reporting each number
None	61%
One	17
Two	7
Three	15
	100%
	(5,422)

Once again, we find results somewhat at odds with the previous findings. This question locates fewer cheaters than either of the earlier two. In fact, the number who cheat according to this question is only slightly more than half of those who have engaged in at least one of the 13 acts listed in the second question.

How can the differing results of the three questions dealing with students' own cheating be interpreted and which of these measures should be used to differentiate the cheaters from the noncheaters? The subsequent analysis hinges upon the successful resolution of these issues.

Interpreting the Differences

As we have seen, the three questions about students' own cheating behavior differ both in the proportion of students they classify as cheaters and in the kinds of cheating they indicate as most prevalent. Table 4.11 summarizes the findings from the three questions.

TABLE 4.11

Summary of Findings from Three Questions about Students' Cheating Behavior

Questions	% of students classified as cheaters	Work on which academic dishonesty is most prevalent	Method of academic dishonesty most often used
Four Forms of Academic Dishonesty	50	On tests and exams and on papers and assignments about equally	Alone and in collusion with others about equally
Thirteen Specific Acts	75	On papers and assignments	Alone
Recent Cheating Incidents	39	On tests and exams	In collusion with others

The fact that different questions on the same topic yield somewhat different results is not surprising to those familiar with survey research. The wording of questions, the number and specificity of items, the complexity of the format, and the order in which questions appear all affect the respondents' reactions to questions and the answers they give. In the case at hand, there are several differences in the nature of these questions that seem to explain the differences in the findings they provide.

The first question asks the student about four fairly broadly defined forms of behavior. Each of the four items mentions a method of cheating and a kind of work on which it occurs. In contrast, the second question asks about a much greater number of more specific forms of behavior. The 13 items go into more detail about methods, types of work, and other circumstances surrounding the occurrence of cheating. Some of the 13 items are not subsumed under the four more general categories of academic dishonesty covered in the first question. Thus the second question yields more cheaters than the first, simply because it covers a wider range of behavior. Furthermore, the more descriptive nature of the items in the second question may have served as a better stimulus to the students' memories. In responding to these items, they may have reported behavior that should have been recorded in the earlier question, but that they failed to recall when answering it.

The third question differs from the earlier two in several important respects. For one thing, it asks for more information and is therefore more difficult to answer. For each cheating incident mentioned, the student was requested to answer a number of questions about the conditions surrounding its occurrence. Moreover, this question asks the student to report behavior that he himself defines as cheating. In the other two questions, the word "cheating" did not appear. Students could admit various forms of behavior in answering the previous questions without explicitly thinking of themselves as cheaters, but they could not in the third question. If students are reluctant to say they have cheated, or if they do not consider that some of the things they admit having done actually constitute cheating, then fewer of them will show up as cheaters on this question, as is, in fact, the case.

Thus, the three questions may be viewed as alternative ways of measuring cheating, differing primarily in how broadly they define academic dishonesty. If, as we assume, all three measure essestially the same phenomenon, then they should tend (within the limits set by the different cutting points) to classify students the same way. That is, those who are classified as cheaters according to the narrowest measure (recent cheating incidents) should be included among those classified as cheaters on the intermediate measure (four forms of academic dishonesty) who, in turn, should be included among those counted as cheaters on the broadest measure (13 specific acts). This kind of overlap would indicate that the three questions are indeed more or less inclusive measures of academic dishonesty.[4] Table 4.12 shows the extent to which the broader measures of academic dishonesty overlap with the narrower ones.

We shall have more to say about the specific patterns in Table 4.12 later on. Now we wish to call attention to the fact that, for 92 per cent of the respondents, these questions serve as successively inclusive measures of academic dishonesty. If a student is classified as a cheater on the basis of a narrower measure, he will almost always be so classified on a broader one. Thus, the three measures differ primarily in how tightly they draw the boundaries around cheating

---

[4] The reader familiar with measurement theory will recognize that these are the assumptions of a Guttman Scale.

TABLE 4.12

Patterns of Classification on The Three Measures of Academic Dishonesty

	Pattern of Classification (+ = cheater, - = non cheater)				
	Recent Incident	Four Forms	Thirteen Acts	Number in each Pattern	% of Sample
Patterns representing inclusiveness of successively broader measures	-	-	-	1165	21%
	-	-	+	1310	24
	-	+	+	698	13
	+	+	+	1816	34
				(4989)	(92%)
	+	-	+	270	5
	-	+	-	109	2
	+	+	-	36	1
	+	-	-	18	a
				(433)	(8%)
			TOTAL	(5422)	100%

behavior. Apparently, they all have some forms of behavior in common, but they seem to differ in that each narrower measure excludes some forms of behavior included in the others.

But how do they differ in what they cover? Do they simply include more or less cheating behavior, or do they differ in the extent to which they include a specific kind of academically questionable behavior? The evidence in Table 4.11 suggests that the latter is the case. There we see a clear relationship between the number of students a question classifies as cheaters and the kinds of cheating it indicates as most prevalent. The more cheaters a question yields, the more prevalent it shows cheating on papers and assignments and cheating without collusion to be.

This strongly suggests that the primary difference between these measures lies in the extent to which they include cheating on papers and assignments and cheating without collusion. Students themselves seem to be reluctant to consider questionable behavior in the preparation of papers and assignments as cheating, and deviations that occur without the collusion of others also seem to be more easily rationalized as not being cheating behavior. This conclusion is supported by the data on hand. Tables 4.8 and 4.9 make it clear that cases of copying on exams were reported as cheating incidents more often than cases of plagiarizing on papers, yet, according to students' responses to the question about four forms of academic dishonesty, shown in Table 4.4, these two forms of misbehavior are about equally prevalent. When asked about cheating incidents, the kind of behavior that typically comes to students' minds seems to be cheating that occurs on tests and exams and cheating that involves collusion with others. This may be the classic image of cheating in the minds of college students. It is also possible that the use of the term "plagiarism" in the first question led students to believe that it was to be distinguished from "cheating."

If students were not inclined to think of plagiarism when reporting cheating incidents, they were even less likely to think of some of the acts on the list of 13. The number who admitted "copying a few sentences of material without footnoting in a paper"--the most prevalent of the 13--is greater than the total number who reported cheating incidents. In fact, fewer than half of those who checked only one of the five items in the list of 13 referring to questionable behavior in connection with papers and assignments reported a cheating incident.

Nor were students inclined to think of items on the list of 13 as cases of plagiarism. Not footnoting as we asked about it would seem to be subsumed under plagiarism, one of the four forms of cheating mentioned in the first question; copying answers instead of doing the work independently may also fit into this category. Yet more students admit each of these specific acts than indicate having plagiarized. They must feel that in one way or another these two acts escape the full implication of the term "plagiarism."[5] In short, some of the most prevalent acts on the list of 13 do not fall within the conception of cheating held by many students, nor do they come under their idea of plagiarism as referred to in the first question.

We did not ask students to define academic dishonesty, but the inferences we have made concerning their conception of cheating are supported by the results of an unpublished pilot study done at a university in California concerning students' opinions about what constitutes cheating.

Since it bears directly on the issue at hand, we shall quote a short section of this report.[6]

> "Respondents were asked to express their opinions as to whether they considered each of eight situations to constitute cheating, to be on the borderline, or not to constitute cheating. Four situations were identified by nearly everyone as definitely cheating.

---

[5] Of course, students may have been unfamiliar with the word "plagiarism" and, for this reason, have failed to report behavior that should have fallen in this category. This is unlikely, however, since only about 2 per cent of the respondents failed to give an answer to the item about plagiarism, which is no more than the per cent failing to answer each of the other three items in the first question.

[6] The study was conducted by the Survey Research Center, University of California at Berkley.

> 99 per cent considered copying an answer from someone else during an exam to be definitely cheating.
>
> 99 per cent considered referring to notes during a closed book examination to be definitely cheating.
>
> 96 per cent considered submitting another student's work as one's own to be definitely cheating.
>
> 92 per cent considered having a paper ghost written to be definitely cheating.
>
> "Two situations were judged not to be cheating at all by a substantial majority of students.
>
> 98 per cent did not consider studying with others in preparation for an examination to constitute cheating.
>
> 83 per cent did not consider using study aids like commercially published class notes in preparation for an examination to constitute cheating. (Fourteen percent placed this on the borderline.)
>
> "There was less agreement on 'submitting the same term paper for two different courses' and 'paraphrasing secondary sources with no citation.' The results of these two situations are presented below.

	Situation	
	Submitting the same term paper for two different courses	Paraphrasing secondary sources with no citation
Definitely cheating	22%	41%
On the borderline	39	47
Not cheating at all	36	7
No opinion	3	5
Number of cases	(432)	(438)

Of the eight situations covered in the California study, four refer to exams and four to papers. Students had no difficulty agreeing on whether the items dealing with exams constituted cheating or not, but of the four dealing with papers, two show that the largest number (although not a majority) felt that the situation was "on the borderline" between what is definitely cheating and what is not cheating at all. The rules governing legitimate and illegitimate procedures in the preparation of papers are thus shown to be less clear to students than those pertaining to preparing for and taking exams, results consistent with our own findings.

One of the two borderline situations, "paraphrasing secondary sources with no citation" is quite similar to the most prevalent of the 13 acts referred to in our second question, and, as we have already noted, many students who checked this item did not indicate that they had cheated or plagiarized in response to the other questions. Thus the California study supports our conclusion that this kind of behavior does not constitute academic dishonesty in the minds of many students.

Of the four situations that the California students considered to be "definitely cheating," three are very similar to items in our first question dealing with four forms of academic dishonesty. We thus have confirmation that three of the four items in this battery definitely constitute cheating in the minds of college students. Only the item about plagiarism that appears in this battery remains unconfirmed. But there is little doubt that most students consider plagiarism to be dishonest behavior. The term itself denotes purloining or stealing the writings of work of another and passing it off as one's own. Virtually all the students in our sample seemed to be familiar with the word. And although some may have a more strict conception of what constitutes plagiarism than others, it seems likely that all would agree that plagiarism is definitely a form of academic dishonesty.

In view of these considerations, it would seem that our first question about four forms of academic dishonesty provides a sound basis for classifying students as cheaters or not. We can feel confident that it covers forms of behavior that students themselves define as academic dishonesty, something that we cannot be sure of with respect to all 13 items in the second question. Furthermore, it provides a more objective measure of academic dishonesty than does the third question, which asks students to classify themselves as cheaters. Thus in the chapters that follow we shall define as cheaters students who admit having done any of the following: Copied from another student during an exam, plagiarized from published materials on a paper, turned in a paper done entirely or in part by another student, or used crib notes during an exam.

As we have already noted, this measure classifies half the sample as cheaters, a proportion falling between those of the other two measures. From Table 4.12 we see that the great majority of those who show up as cheaters on this question are also classified as cheaters on one or both of the other two questions. About a third of the entire sample show up as cheaters on all three questions. Another 13 per cent are classified as cheaters on both this question and the one dealing with 13 specific acts. These two groups constitute pure scale types in the Guttman theory of scaling. Only two nonscale types fall into our category of cheaters: the 2 per cent who gave an affirmative response to this question but not to the other two, and the 1 per cent who in addition to citing one or more of these forms of cheating also cited a recent cheating incident but did not check any of the 13 specific acts. Excluded from this definition of the cheaters are those who only admit to one or more of the

13 acts (mainly acts of more debatable cheating status) but deny having committed any of the four forms of academic dishonesty and do not cite any acts of cheating since coming to college. The exclusion of these cases (about a quarter of the sample) means that our estimate of the number of cheaters is a conservative one. This decision seems justified, however, on the grounds that many students would question that all 13 acts are truly instances of academic dishonesty.

A more arbitrary and debatable issue is our decision to exclude the five per cent of the sample who in their own eyes have participated in a cheating incident even though they failed to answer affirmatively to any of the four forms of cheating. From Table 4.12 we see that almost all of the students in this category also admit to at least one of the 13 acts covered by the second question. It is our hunch, to be tested in a more detailed analysis at some later time, that most of these self-defined cheaters who do not show up on our first measure, are students who are confessing to acts that fall on the borderline between the legitimate and illegitimate, and for this reason should be excluded from the category of cheaters. In any case, the exclusion of these cases only increases the conservatism of our estimate of the proportion of cheaters in the sample.[7]

---

[7] We should note that the great majority of those classified as cheaters on this index have engaged in more than one cheating incident. However, some 14 per cent of the sample (less than a third of those we are classifying as cheaters) admit to only one cheating incident according to this measure; that is, they report having cheated only once on only one of the four forms. A question might be raised about including these one-time offenders with the repeaters. The decision to do so was based largely on the fact that when this index was related to a variety of other variables, the one-time offenders appeared to be more like the group who cheated more than once than like those who had never cheated at all.

Before making use of our index of academic dishonesty to find out how cheaters differ from noncheaters, there is another issue that must be clarified--how these measures of cheating are patterned over time; that is, their distribution by year in school.

Year in School and Academic Dishonesty

All three questions that we have been examining in this chapter are cumulative. They ask students whether or not they have engaged in academic dishonesty since coming to college. Students can move in only one direction on such measures; they can only add to their cheating behavior with each successive year in college. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the level of cheating increases from freshman to senior year. What is particularly important for the subsequent analysis, however, is the rate of increase from year to year. If it is particularly great, then we must always take year in school into account; if it is not great, then we may safely ignore this variable and treat the cheaters all together.

Table 4.13 presents the three measures of academic dishonesty we have already described by year in school. The table also presents a fourth measure, a noncumulative one: admissions of cheating in the previous term.[8]

---

[8] In the question about recent cheating incidents, we asked respondents to provide information on each of the incidents they reported, including whether the incident occurred in one of the courses they took during the previous term. Somewhat more than half of those who reported a cheating incident, or about a quarter of the sample, indicated that at least one of the cheating incidents occurred in the previous term. This aspect of the question permits us to measure cheating during a period of time that is equal for all students and, thereby, to arrive at comparable rates for students in different academic years.

TABLE 4.13

Per Cent Cheating According to Four Different Measures by Year in School

Measures of Academic Dishonesty	Year in School Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
% engaging in one or more of the four types of cheating behavior	43	49	54	53
% engaging in one or more of the thirteen specific acts	72	76	77	78
% reporting a cheating incident in which they took part	35	40	42	43
% reporting a cheating incident in which they took part last term	28	27	25	21
	(1,593)	(1,368)	(1,284)	(1,106)

The first three measures, which are cumulative, do show an increase in cheating over time, but what is surprising is that the trend is so slight. The overall difference between freshman and seniors ranges only from 6 to 10 percentage points on the various measures. Moreover, the trend occurs only through the junior year; seniors, even though they have had one more year in which to be tempted by cheating, are no more likely to cheat than juniors.

That cheating increases only moderately through the first three years of college and then levels off at the junior year indicates that there is a decreasing rate of cheating as students advance through college. And this is what the fourth measure, cheating in the previous term, shows. Here we see that a slightly smaller proportion of students in each successive year have cheated in the previous term. Perhaps advanced students find it more difficult to cheat because, as we saw in the preceding chapter, the advanced courses provide fewer opportunities for cheating. Or perhaps advanced students feel more secure academically simply by virtue of having survived the first few years of college.

But there is still another implication of the data in Table 4.13. Much of the recent cheating on the part of upperclassmen must be repetition of academic dishonesty committed in the earlier years of their college careers, since their recent cheating adds virtually nothing to the cumulative rate tapped by the first three measures. In other words, the proportion of "new cheaters" among the 21 per cent of seniors who cheated in the previous term must be extremely low since the cumulative level does not increase between the junior and senior year. These patterns suggest that cheating occurs relatively early in the student's college career; most of those who are going to cheat seem to do so not long after they arrive at college.

Another process that no doubt affects this pattern is the progressive attrition of the poorer students, those who might presumably be more prone to cheat. Were it not for this process of selection, we might well find the trend toward cheating to be more marked than in fact it is. In any case, we now know that year in school is not a major correlate of cheating and that we may safely contrast cheaters with noncheaters without worrying that the results are merely an artifact of year in school.

We began this chapter by showing that students perceive more cheating on campus than do deans and students body presidents, but that even students tend to underestimate the amount of cheating that occurs.[9]

We then carefully examined three questions dealing with students' reports of their own cheating to find out how much cheating occurs and what kinds of cheating are most prevalent. We saw that these questions vary primarily in how broadly they defined academic dishonesty, with the narrower definition almost always being included in the broader ones.

A chief concern of the chapter has been to assess these various indicators of cheating as bases for classifying students. As a result of this analysis, we have chosen the battery that provides a middle-level estimate of the proportion of cheaters, partly on the grounds that the items in this question refer to behavior that students themselves define as academic dishonesty and partly because this measure is less subjective than the one asking students to classify themselves as cheaters or noncheaters.

It is noteworthy that the three questions we have examined dealing with students' own cheating behavior show very similar patterns over time. We have seen from Table 5.12 that they are highly related to each other, being more or less inclusive measures of the same phenomenon. For purposes of analysis, it would make very little difference which one we use to classify students. As Lazarsfeld has pointed out, indices that tap the same underlying concept behave alike when related to outside criteria even though they are not perfectly related to one another.[10] The similarity in the patterns these measures show by academic year academic dishonesty from year to year. Whatever errors of classification result from our choosing the index based on the four forms of academic dishonesty to distinguish cheaters from noncheaters will tend to work against our hypotheses and, so, the differences we do uncover using this imperfect measure will be all the more significant. With these considerations in mind, we are now ready to turn to our next task--discovering who cheats in college.

---

[9] No doubt the discrepency between their estimates and the actual rate is even greater than our data indicate. There is probably more cheating among those students who did not return questionnaires than among those who did, and surely, not all of those who did return them admitted all the cheating they had engaged in.

---

[10] For a recent statement of the principle, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Problems in Methodology" in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., eds., Sociology Today, (New York: Basic Books, 1959).

Chapter 5

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND CHEATING

This chapter begins our examination of the characteristics of students who, by their own admission, have cheated in their college courses. Our objective is to discover why some students cheat and others do not. In the course of the analysis we shall learn something about the psychology or personality of cheating students and the kinds of pressures acting upon students that either enhance or inhibit the likelihood that they will engage in academic dishonesty.

We already know that academic dishonesty is not something that students automatically learn during their college career; we have seen that, although opportunities to cheat steadily increase with time spent in college, the proportion of cheaters does not increase markedly from one year to the next. In fact, as we saw in Chapter 3, the incidence of recent cheating (cheating in the last term) actually decreases slightly from the freshman to the senior year of college. Clearly, then, the tendency to cheat must be found in other characteristics of the students--their values and attitudes, for example, or their abilities and interests--characteristics that presumably do not change markedly during the four years of college. In this chapter we shall focus on the kinds of adjustments the respondents have made to the role of student; that is, their level of performance and their mode of performance in the academic sector of college life. We shall look at their grades in college as a measure of their intellectual abilities and academic performance. We shall then look at several indicators of the effectiveness of their study habits and, in the final section, we shall return to the theme of grades, this time taking into account the importance that the students themselves and, in their judgment, their parents attribute to grades.

But, before we can look for the determinants of cheating in the ways students have adjusted to their academic work, there is a prior issue to be considered. It is possible that students cheat simply because they do not consider such behavior to be wrong. After all, deviant behavior, wherever it arises, is behavior that violates a particular set of moral standards. Many deviants do not think of themselves as such for the simple reason that they do not accept the moral standards that define their behavior as wrong. And so, before we go too far in the analysis of the pressures leading to academic dishonesty, we must first look at how students feel about cheating. Do they strongly disapprove of this kind of behavior or do they tolerate cheating, perhaps because they see it as a necessary part of their life as students?

Students' Attitudes Toward Cheating

To find out students' attitudes toward academic dishonesty, we asked them to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with six statements about cheating, statements that indicate a moral stance toward this kind of behavior. The distribution of responses to these items is shown in Table 5.1.

The first four items in Table 5.1 are alike in that each brings out a moral attitude toward cheating. As the data clearly show, college students overwhelmingly disapprove of academic dishonesty. The

TABLE 5.1

Students' Attitudes Toward Cheating

	Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Not Sure	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly	
The individual's personal integrity or self-respect should be the basis for the decision not to cheat	75%	17	4	2	2	100% (5,327)
Students are morally obliged not to cheat	69%	21	5	3	2	100% (5,326)
Cheating directly contradicts the goals of education	68%	20	6	4	2	100% (5,324)
Under no circumstances is cheating justified	63%	21	8	6	2	100% (5,332)
The student who starts cheating soon becomes lost in his course work	28%	30	24	13	5	100% (5,303)
Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating	8%	12	24	24	32	100% (5,312)

great majority agree that personal integrity and self-respect should prevent one from cheating, that students are morally obliged not to cheat, that cheating directly contradicts the goals of education, and that under no circumstances is cheating justified. More than four out of five students agree with these statements and, just as significantly, more than three in five express a strong agreement. A further indication of the strong negative feeling students have toward cheating is shown by the sixth item. There may be no great love for the students who turn in their fellows for cheating, but it is clear that a majority of students consider it worse to cheat than to report another student for this offense.

The almost unanimous disapproval of cheating on the part of the students in our sample (as shown by the first four items in Table 5.1) is quite startling in view of the sizeable proportion who admit to cheating. Apparently, many students who think cheating is morally wrong nonetheless do so. Several conclusions seem justified. First, it is clear that the widespread cheating that occurs on many college campuses does not mean that students hold values that are contrary to those underlying our system of higher education. If college students cheat, it is not because they do not think cheating is wrong. The second conclusion that follows is that there must be powerful forces at work leading students to cheat in spite of their negative attitude toward such behavior.

One clue to the discrepancy between attitude and behavior is provided by the fifth item in Table 5.1--whether the students think that one who cheats is soon lost in his work. Considerably fewer (although still a majority) agree with this statement, suggesting that many students do not see cheating as a hindrance to academic progress. On the contrary, it may be that these students see cheating as helping them achieve important goals, notably academic success. To paraphrase Shakespeare's Brutus, it is as if many of these students were to say, "It is not that we love honesty less, but that we love success more."

These observations, based on the discrepancy between students' attitudes toward cheating and their behavior in this area, should not be construed to imply that there is no relationship between attitude and behavior. On the contrary, it would be most surprising if their value-orientations had no bearing on their behavior in the classroom. To show that there is indeed a close connection between the two, we have constructed an index of disapproval of cheating based on the number of "strongly agree" responses the student made to the first four statements. The strong relationship between attitude and behavior can be seen from Table 5.2.

TABLE 5.2

Per Cent Cheating by Strength of
Personal Disapproval of Cheating

Index of Personal Disapproval	% Cheating
Strongly Agree With:	
All Four Statements	35 (2,038)
Three Statements	43 (1,309)
Two Statements	57 (866)
One Statement	72 (606)
None of the Statements	78 (442)

As we move from strong disapproval to weak disapproval or tolerance of cheating, we find that the proportion of students who cheat increases markedly, the overall difference being some 43 percentage points.[1]

---

[1] Strictly speaking, we should not refer to cheaters in the present tense, since the index refers to cheating that students have engaged in since coming to college and a number of them undoubtedly have stopped cheating as they have advanced through school. Nevertheless, as a matter of stylistic convenience, we shall refer to this group throughout in the present tense, using such terms as "cheaters," "students who cheat," and "those who engage in cheating." Judging from the substantial proportion who cheated during the last term, this convention is not completely arbitrary.

Just knowing how a student feels about cheating, then, takes us a long way in predicting whether he will engage in this kind of behavior. But equally important is the fact that more than a third of the students who most strongly disapprove of cheating nonetheless admit to cheating. (Since students are apt to underreport their cheating, it is quite possible that substantially more than a third of the strong disapprovers have cheated.) Moreover, at the other extreme we find that not all those who are tolerant of cheating engage in it. Almost a quarter of the students who do not hold academic honesty as a value are, nonetheless, noncheaters.

Thus, the deviant cases in Table 5.2 are a reminder that the incidence of cheating is the result of much more than the student's personal position on this form of behavior. We must still search for the conditions that permit some students to act in accordance with their moral standards and those that pressure others to violate their moral code.

Academic Performance and Cheating: The Role of Grades

Cheating is, of course, a manifestation of using illegitimate means to achieve a legitimate end, in this case academic success or at least the avoidance of academic failure. As Merton has pointed out, deviant behavior in pursuit of approved ends is apt to occur when access to legitimate means is restricted.[2] In the case at hand, restricted means translates primarily into a lack of ability to perform well in college courses. We can expect the poor students, those who have difficulty keeping up with the work in their courses, to be the ones most tempted to cheat. This image of the cheater is certainly widespread among college deans and student body presidents. "Students with bad grades" or "poor students" or some equivalent phrase constitutes the most frequent response of deans and student body presidents to a question asking what groups or kinds of students on their campus cheat or plagiarize more often than others. They seem to feel that this is the most common characteristic of students who engage in academic dishonesty on their campuses.

---

[2] Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," in Social Theory Social Structure (rev.; New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957), pp. 131-160.

A proper test of the "ability" hypothesis would require some measure of intellectual capacity such as I.Q.s or college aptitude scores. Unfortunately, we do not have such a measure. Instead, we must make do with the student's grades in college, which reflect not only his ability but also his motivation. Moreover, there is the possibility that grades are also contaminated by our dependent variable of cheating. Perhaps some students have performed above their ability level because they have cheated, and others, because they were caught cheating, may have received lower grades than their capacity would suggest. Nonetheless, we shall treat grades as an indicator of ability, although we are aware that they reflect motivation as well. Table 5.3 shows the relationship between college grade point average and cheating.

That there is much truth to the image of the cheater held by college deans and student body presidents is seen from the inverse relationship between grade average and cheating. The proportion cheating steadily increases as academic standing decreases, the difference between the extremes being 20 percentage points. This correlation is, of course,

TABLE 5.3

Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average in College

Grade Average	% Cheating	
A	37	(288)
B+	39	(559)
B	43	(786)
B-	50	(993)
C+	54	(1,126)
C	54	(929)
C- or lower	57	(569)

not surprising. What is perhaps more surprising is that the relationship is not stronger than it is. Just as we saw that a number of students who strongly disapprove of cheating still cheat, we now learn that more than a third of even the "A" students have resorted to cheating. Moreover, many of the students with the worst grades do not cheat; in fact the proportion of cheating among the poorest students--those with C- or lower averages--is only slightly greater than the proportion in the entire sample. Perhaps cheating does pay off for some students in the form of higher grades, and perhaps even students with great ability still feel competitive pressures to cheat.

It is possible that poor students feel increasing pressure to cheat as they progress through school. To avoid flunking out of college, they may become more and more tempted to resort to illegitimate means to pass their courses. If there is any truth in this hypothesis, we should find that academic standing is more strongly related to cheating in the more advanced years of college than in the early years. Table 5.4 shows that this is indeed the case.

(Since we are dealing with three variables, we have collapsed the grade distribution to three groups.)

TABLE 5.4

Per Cent Cheating by Year in School and Grade Average

	Year in School			
Grade Average	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
High (B or higher)	37 (421)	39 (366)	45 (418)	42 (396)
Medium (B- or C+)	41 (570)	52 (530)	58 (573)	57 (517)
Low (C or lower)	49 (574)	55 (457)	63 (277)	64 (179)
% Differences	-12	-16	-18	-22

The rows of Table 5.4 tell us what we already learned in Chapter 3, that cheating tends to increase somewhat from the freshman to the junior year. But we now learn something additional: this tendency is somewhat more pronounced among the poorest students. By studying the columns, we see that the negative relationship between grades and cheating does increase from the freshman to the senior year, an indication of the cumulative pressure on the poorer students to engage in cheating in order to survive in college. Moreover, this relationship occurs in spite of the fact that the poorest students tend to drop out or flunk out with each passing year. This selective attrition can be seen from the base figures in Table 5.4. Students with C averages or worse constitute 36 per cent of the freshman class, 33 per cent of the sophomore class, 21 per cent of the junior class, and only 17 per cent of the senior class. This attrition notwithstanding, Table 5.3 and 5.4 show that, although grades are indeed important to an understanding of cheating, they do not tell the whole story about academic dishonesty. Even among sen

Even among seniors, grades are not nearly as associated with cheating as are students' attitudes toward academic dishonesty, as we saw in Table 5.2.

Since the poor students are under greater pressure to cheat, we might suppose that they become more tolerant of cheating, perceiving it as less of an evil than the better students. But when grades are related to the index of disapproval, we find only a weak relationship in the expected direction. Some 42 per cent of the high performers (those with a B average or higher) are also in the highest disapproval group, compared with 34 per cent of the poor performers (those with a C average or lower), a difference of only 8 percentage points. Students' moral positions on cheating, then, are to a considerable extent independent of their academic performances. They do not automatically develop the values that might be most convenient for them.

Having seen that personal disapproval of cheating operates as a strong deterrent to academic dishonesty, whereas having poor grades serves as a pressure toward cheating, we are now prepared to consider how these two attributes interact to account for the deviant cases we have noted. We might assume that the students who cheat in spite of their moral stance against this behavior do so because of their academic shortcomings and that the good students who cheat do so because they do not hold academic honesty in high regard. The cases at the other extremes might be explained in the same way. Thus, the students who do not cheat even though they do not consider cheating a serious offense may be students of high ability, and the poor students who do not cheat may be those who are kept in check by their moral aversion to this kind of dishonesty.

The joint effect of personal disapproval of cheating and grades on the proportion of students cheating is shown in Table 5.5.

TABLE 5.5

Per Cent Cheating by Personal Disapproval of Cheating and Grades

Index of Personal Disapproval of Cheating	Grade Average High (B or higher)	 Medium (B- and C+)	 Low (C or lower)	 % Difference
High	30 (674)	37 (849)	37 (487)	- 7
Medium	44 (675)	57 (864)	56 (612)	-12
Low	65 (244)	76 (440)	82 (347)	-17
% Difference	-35	-39	-45	

By comparing the columns and rows of Table 5.5, we see that the students' attitudes toward cheating are much more closely related to their cheating behavior than are their grades. Whatever the students' grades, their tendency to cheat increases markedly as their disapproval of cheating lessens, but, when attitudes are held constant, grades have only a moderate effect on cheating.

The interaction of academic grades and personal disapproval of cheating is particularly interesting. Among students who strongly disapprove of cheating (the top row of the Table), academic performance makes hardly any difference. The poorest students in this category are almost as unlikely to cheat as the best students. It is only when students are free of internal constraints against cheating that their academic performance has a strong effect on cheating. Thus, although all the students most tolerant of cheating (the third row) tend toward academic dishonesty to a much greater extent than the others, the tendency is even more marked among the poor students in this category. Just as attitude toward cheating serves as a condition affecting the relationship between grades and academic dishonesty, so grades operate as a condition affecting the relationship between attitude and behavior. As can be seen from the percentage difference in each column, the effect of the students' moral positions on their cheating behavior increases as their grades deteriorate. The reason for this is that the good students who do not feel strongly about cheating are not as prone to cheat as the poor students who share their attitude, and the poor students who strongly disapprove of cheating are sufficiently restrained by their moral stance so that they tend not to cheat even though their grades are low.

Taken together, these two variables take us some distance toward accounting for the variance in cheating. When high performance coincides with strong disapproval, less than a third of the students cheat, whereas the combination of weak disapproval of cheating and poor grades results in more than four out of five students' being cheaters.

The main conclusion to be drawn from Table 5.5 is that internalizing the proper moral values is a much more significant factor affecting students' behavior with respect to cheating than their low intellectual ability, which might be thought of as indicating their "need" to cheat or their "vested interest" in cheating. As sociological research has repeatedly shown, men's ideas of how they should act, quite apart from their utilitarian interests, are important determinants of their behavior. And since these ideas tend to develop through interaction with others; that is, are learned in and anchored in social groups, important aspects of the problem of academic dishonesty are to be found in the students' relations with others and the norms and values held by those with whom they interact. This story, however, is reserved for a later chapter (Chapter 8). For the time being, we shall continue to treat the students as if they each existed in a social vacuum, examining their personal attributes as they bear on the tendency toward academic dishonesty.

Study Habits and Cheating

We have examined the role of grades in cheating on the assumption that they are an indicator of the student's ability or intellectual capacity. But we also know that, in addition to ability, grades reflect motivation--the student's willingness to work hard on his course work. There are undoubtedly a number of capable students who do poorly in college simply because they take little interest in their courses and devote little time to them. Conversely, other students "overachieve" by virtue of the effort they devote to study and the study habits they develop. Questions dealing with these topics were asked of the students in the sample. We know how many hours they spend on their studies each week and we know something about their study habits, notably whether they stay up to date on their reading, homework, laboratory assignments, and course work in general. Highly motivated students presumably develop good study habits. They are apt to keep up with their course work and to use their study time efficiently. We can take the responses to such questions as indicating the extent to which students have learned the role of the "good student"; that is, the extent to which they have developed the habits that contribute to academic success. Our assumption is that students who, because of their motivation to succeed or any other reason, have assimilated the role of "good student" will have less difficulty doing well in their courses and hence will experience less temptation to cheat.

The first item to be examined is the amount of time students devote to their studies. It is reasonable to suppose that this is related to academic success, but there are undoubtedly many exceptions. The dull student may have to devote an inordinate amount of time to study in order to assimilate what the bright student gains in a much shorter period of time. This caveat notwithstanding, the data show that there is indeed a negative relationship between time spent on studies and cheating, as is shown in Table 5.6.

TABLE 5.6

Per Cent Cheating by Time Spent on Studies

Time spent on studies	% Cheating
0-19 hours per week	57 (1,695)
20-29 hours per week	49 (1,785)
30 or more hours per week	42 (1,908)

The number of hours devoted to study is presumably a sign of the extent to which students are keeping up with their course work. But this inference is not necessary because we have more direct information on students' study habits in the courses they completed in the previous term. We know whether they had to rely on last minute cramming to prepare for their exams, whether they stayed up to date on their reading assignments. As might be expected, the more courses in which students developed good study habits, the less prone they were to cheat. This is shown in Table 5.7.

TABLE 5.7

Per Cent Cheating by Three Aspects of
Study Habits in Last Term Courses

Behavior in Courses	Number of last term courses		
	2-5	1	0
Relied on last minute studying or cramming almost entirely in preparing for tests and exams	58 (1546)	55 (1316)	40 (2190)
	4-5	3	0-2
Did not stay up to date in reading and preparation for class	55 (2321)	48 (1108)	48 (1844)
	5	4	0-3
Failed to complete all the required homework or lab assignments	54 (1876)	49 (1083)	45 (2379)

The amount of time that students spend on their studies can be treated as an indicator of their commitment to their academic work, whereas the items that we have referred to as good study habits suggest the degree to which students have been efficient in their study. These two dimensions of the student role are, of course, related. The more students study, the more apt they are to be on top of their course work. But, as we have already noted, these two elements need not go together. The bright student may keep up to date with a minimum of effort and the dull student may lag behind in spite of his commitment to studying hard. Since we know that each of these aspects of the student role is related to cheating, it is interesting to see what effect one has when the other is held constant. This can be seen from Table 5.8, which shows the simultaneous effect of time spent on studies and the three items that refer to effective study habits.

TABLE 5.8

Per Cent Cheating by Three Indicators of Study Habits in Last Term Courses, Controlling for Time Spent Studying

Behavior in Courses	Number of Last Term Courses	Hours Spent Studying During an Average Week		
		0 - 19	20 - 29	30 or more
Relied on last minute studying or cramming almost entirely in preparing for tests and exams	2-5	62 (674)	60 (468)	51 (396)
	1	64 (385)	34 (461)	49 (464)
	0	48 (533)	41 (728)	35 (904)
Did not stay up to date in reading and preparation for class	3-5	60 (964)	53 (784)	48 (709)
	2	58 (311)	45 (382)	45 (401)
	0,1	51 (419)	46 (619)	35 (788)
Failed to complete all the required homework or lab assignments	2-5	60 (738)	51 (609)	49 (517)
	1	58 (308)	52 (351)	40 (418)
	0	55 (613)	46 (796)	39 (943)

The data of Table 5.7 indicate that both time spent on studies and effectiveness of study independently affect the likelihood of cheating. Thus, whatever the number of hours they study, students who keep up to date on their course work are less prone to cheat than those who fall behind. But, at the same time, students who spend a great deal of time on their studies are less prone to cheat even when they have not mastered their work. The behavior of these students with respect to cheating is more difficult to understand than that of their more facile peers who keep up to date without studying hard. After all, the latter are presumably bright enough to do well in their courses even though they do not work hard. The findings suggest that hours spent studying indeed do reflect commitment to the student role, even for the ineffective students. Such students are prepared to play by the rules of the game and to take the consequences for their failure to be more effective in their studies. The largest concentration of cheaters is to be found among those who treat their role as student most lightly, those who study neither long nor efficiently.

Having seen that study habits, like grades, are related to cheating, we may now consider whether poor study habits place a strain on students' moral commitment not to cheat. Just as we looked at the simultaneous effects of grades and disapproval, so shall we now see how study habits interact with disapproval in accounting for cheating. To simplify the analysis we have combined the three items referring to efficiency of course preparation into an index of study habits.[3]

TABLE 5.9

Per Cent Cheating by Disapproval of Cheating
and Efficiency of Study Habits

	Study Habits			
Disapproval of Cheating	Good	Fair	Poor	% Difference
Very Strong	29 (655)	37 (618)	40 (574)	-11
Moderate	44 (578)	53 (659)	59 (749)	-15
Weak	72 (200)	75 (297)	78 (457)	- 6
% Difference	-38	-38	-43	

---

[3] The three study habit items, trichotomized as in Table 5.7, were used to form an index. On each item, a score of 2 was assigned to students who were prepared in the specified way in most of their courses, 1 to those who were prepared in an intermediate number of courses, and 0 to those who were prepared in the fewest courses. The resulting index was collapsed into three groups ranging from good to poor study habits.

The table shows that on every level of study habits the correlation between disapproval and cheating continues to be quite strong. We also see that study habits have some effect, to be sure a much smaller one, even when disapproval is held constant. So far the results are very much like those presented in Table 5.5, in which we examined disapproval in combination with grades.

But there is one interesting difference between the two tables. Grades, we saw, made only a small difference among those who strongly disapprove of cheating. Their effect was much greater among those who were only weakly opposed to cheating. In Table 5.9, we see that the reverse is true. Effectiveness of study habits is more strongly related to cheating among those who are high or medium on disapproval of cheating than among those who are low on disapproval. Lack of preparation in course work apparently places more of a strain on students to violate their moral stance against cheating than do poor grades. In some ways this seems quite plausible. Students who feel ill-prepared are apt to approach their exams with great anxiety, and some of them may feel that they can only pass by cheating, even though they find cheating quite distasteful. Perhaps a low grade average does not place the same amount of strain on the students who have a clear aversion to cheating because many students do not know before their finals that they will end up with low grades. In short, the fear of failure as a result of poor preparation, rather than the fact of failure, is what seems to pressure students who strongly disapprove of cheating to engage in academic dishonesty. Too much should not be made of this argument, however. After all, the differences in the rows of Table 5.9 are fairly small. And just as we saw that a number of students who both disapprove strongly and have good grades still cheat, so we now see that almost a third of those who prepare efficiently for their courses and strongly disapprove also cheat.

Academic Awards, Scholarships, and Cheating

We have one final piece of information bearing on the students' academic abilities--whether they have been awarded fellowships or scholarships and, if so, the basis for the award. Only about a third of the students have been awarded scholarships of any kind, and not all of these received this award in recognition of their academic ability. Some 17 per cent of the sample said they were given scholarships because of their financial need, and a tiny fraction, some 2 per cent, had athletic scholarships; this leaves only 14 per cent who said their fellowships were awarded in recognition of their academic ability or achievement. Those holding athletic scholarships, as might be expected, are the poorest students. Only 16 per cent of them have a B average or higher. Among students without any fellowships, 24 per cent have above average grades. Students awarded aid because of financial need turn out to be brighter than the average, 34 per cent of them having B or higher grades. But they still do not perform as well as those who were given scholarships in recognition of their merit, for this group has the highest grade average of all; some 61 per cent of them have B or higher grades. On the basis of their grades, then, we might expect that the students who have fellowships as a result of their abilities cheat least, followed by those who have fellowships based on their financial need, students without fellowships, and, finally, the athletes, who are most lacking in academic achievement. The data in Table 5.10, however, show that this expectation is not completely correct.

TABLE 5.10

Per Cent Cheating by Basis of Fellowship Award

Fellowship based on	% Cheating	
Academic ability	45	(738)
Financial Need	41	(869)
Athletic ability	74	(80)
No fellowship	51	(3,407)

The students with athletic scholarships are in college for reasons totally unrelated to their academic abilities, and we now see that the proportion of cheaters in this group is particularly high. Students with scholarships based on need and on achievement are, as we expected, less prone to cheat than students without scholarships, but, somewhat surprisingly, those whose scholarships are based on merit are slightly more likely to cheat than those who receive scholarships based on financial need. Perhaps the latter are too frightened to cheat for fear that they will jeopardize their scholarships, or perhaps those who hold scholarships based on ability and performance feel such pressures to achieve that they resort to cheating. In any case, their level of cheating is somewhat lower than we would expect on the basis of their grades alone.

The Importance of Grades and Cheating

In the preceding sections, we examined various objective indicators of academic performance--grades, effectiveness of study habits, and scholarships--in order to see the extent to which poor academic performance operates as a pressure toward cheating. The underlying reasoning, of course, is that students cheat in order to compensate for their shortcomings and improve their academic performance. But an important subjective variable has been missing from the analysis, and that is the importance students place on academic success. Whether difficulties in performing the student role lead to cheating would seem to depend on how much students value academic success. The student who wants very much to succeed, but lacks the ability to do so, is presumably under more pressure to cheat than the student of similar ability who places less importance on academic success. (Actually, as we shall see, the facts of the matter are quite different from what this common sense idea would suggest.)

We have data not only on the importance students themselves attach to "gètting good grades," but also on their perception of the importance their parents place on their "getting good grades." And so we are in a position to evaluate the significance of the student's ability to live up to both his own expectations and those of his parents. We shall be concerned with the interactions among four variables: the importance students place on grades, the importance that they think their parents place on grades,[4] their grade average, and their cheating behavior. Since hardly any students responded that grades are "not very important" to them, those that did are grouped with those who said grades were "fairly important."

The crucial part of the analysis will come when we look at the effects of importance of grades and actual grades on cheating behavior.

---

[4] The question dealing with importance of grades reads as follows: "How important is it 1) to your parents, 2) to yourself, that you get good grades in college? Extremely important, Quite important, Fairly important, Not very important."

But first we will consider the information on importance of grades in its own right. Two things should be noted about these data, which are presented in Table 5.11. First, there is, not surprisingly, a strong association between the student's own assessment of the importance of good grades and his perceptions of the importance his parents place on grades, and, second, students tend to assign somewaht more importance to grades than they think their parents do. (The latter can be seen by comparing the column marginals with the row marginals.)

TABLE 5.11

Importance Assigned to Grades by
Students and Their Parents

	Importance to Students				
Importance to parents	Extremely	Quite	Fairly	Row Totals	% of Total
Extremely important	46%	17%	12%	(1,318)	25%
Quite important	37	55	32	(2,357)	44
Fairly important	17	28	56	(1,650)	31
	100%	100%	100%		100%
Column totals	(1,612)	(2,485)	(1,228)	(5,325)	
% of total	30%	47%	23%	100%	

Still ignoring for the moment the academic standing of the student, let us now see whether the importance of grades is related to academic dishonesty. Plausible arguments can be made for a number of quite different outcomes. Students who think grades are extremely important might well be the dedicated students who, by virtue of their ability and motivation, do well in school without having to resort to cheating. But the alternative would also seem plausible. Students who place a high value on good grades may be the ones who take extreme measures, even illegitimate ones, to insure that they will get them. Similar conflicting arguments can be offered for the relationship between parental expectations of performance and cheating. Since the value students place on good grades is strongly associated with their perception of parental expectations, we will examine both of these variables simultaneously to see how they bear on cheating. This is done in Table 5.12.

TABLE 5.12

Per Cent Cheating by Importance Assigned to Grades by Students and Their Parents

	Importance to Parents			
Importance to students	Extremely Important	Quite Important	Fairly Important	% Difference
Extremely important	46 (738)	46 (597)	41 (277)	+ 5
Quite important	55 (427)	51 (1,374)	45 (684)	+10
Fairly important	62 (153)	59 (386)	47 (689)	+12
% difference	-16	-13	-6	

Table 5.12 deserves close scrutiny. Even though there is a strong positive correlation between the importance students give to grades and the importance they believe their parents give to them, we now see that these two variables have quite different effects on cheating. The more importance students give to "good grades," the less likely they are to cheat, no matter how important grades are to their parents. But, holding constant their own evaluation of grades, we find that the more importance they think their parents give to "getting good grades," the more likely are students to cheat. In short, the student's own commitment to good grades acts as a deterrent to cheating

(presumably because he is the committed student who works hard and effectively in his courses), whereas the perception of parents' commitment to good grades acts as a pressure to cheat. To put this still another way, students are less likely to cheat if their own expectations of themselves are high and more likely to cheat if their parents' expectations of them are high.

Also to be noted in Table 5.12 is the interaction between the two independent variables. The student's own evaluation of grades is more closely associated with cheating when the perceived pressure from parents is greatest, and weakest when parental pressure is weakest. But the reverse pattern holds in the rows of Table 5.12. Here we see that perceived parental pressure makes the most difference when students place little importance on grades. When students themselves consider grades very important, they are not apt to cheat no matter how much parental pressure they experience.

The findings in Table 5.12 become less puzzling and are more readily understandable when we examine the relationship between the value placed on good grades and the student's grade average. As the reader may have guessed, students who place a high value on good grades also manage to get good grades, and the reverse relationship holds between perceived parental importance and grades--it is the poor students who are most likely to feel that their parents think grades are extremely important. These relationships are shown in Table 5.13.

The students with a B average or higher are more prone than those with lower grade averages to value getting good grades, whereas the poorest students (those with C averages or lower) are more likely than the others to perceive their parents as placing high value on good grades. It should be noted that an arbitrary assumption about the

TABLE 5.13

Importance Assigned to Grades by Students and Their Parents, by Grade Average of Students

	% of Students Who Think That Good Grades Are "Extremely Important"	
Grade Average	To themselves	To their parents
B or higher	40 (1,607)	23 (1,609)
B- / C+	26 (2,180)	23 (2,185)
C or lower	26 (1,468)	30 (1,472)

nature of the causal connection is implied in the way these data are presented. By treating grades as the independent variable, we are suggesting that the students' own evaluation of grades stems from their performance, with the poor students rationalizing their performance by devaluing grades. But the causal connection could easily work in the other direction; students who place high value on grades may be more motivated to work and perform well.

It is somewhat more difficult to imagine the reverse process when it comes to parental evaluation of grades, though. It seems more plausible that poor performance leads parents to emphasize the importance of grades than that students do poorly because their parents think grades are important. But even this possibility cannot be ignored in an era in which we hear so much about adolescent rebellion against parents.[5]

---

[5] There is still a third possibility. The relationship may not be a causal one at all, but the result of some third variable associated with both of these variables. For example, getting good grades may be highly valued in certain social groups that also are characterized by relatively low academic ability. The data assembled in this survey permit rather extensive analysis of parental expectations, mobility, aspirations, and the like. These themes must wait for further exploration.

Now that we know about the connection between the student's academic performance and his and his parents' evaluations of grades, we might assume that the patterns in Table 5.12 are entirely an artifact of grades. In other words, the negative relationship between the student's own evaluation of grades and his cheating behavior and the positive relationship between cheating and perceived importance of grades to parents are both to be explained by performance. But this is not the case. The hypothesis we stated above--that for students to give high importance to grades indicates commitment to the student role, whereas for students to think that their parents place great importance on grades constitutes a pressure to cheat, still holds true, even when grade average is taken into account. These patterns can be seen in Tables 5.14 and 5.15.

TABLE 5.14

Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and
Students' Evaluation of Good Grades

Student's Evaluation of good grades	Grade Average B or higher	B- / C+	C or lower	% difference
Extremely important	39 (636)	49 (569)	51 (388)	-11
Quite important	42 (745)	52 (1,061)	56 (656)	-14
Fairly important	42 (226)	55 (550)	58 (424)	-16
% difference	- 3	- 6	- 7	

In both Table 5.14 and Table 5.15 we see that grades have a more important effect on cheating than the value placed on grades either by the student himself or, as he sees it, by his parents (compare the columns and rows in each table). When actual performance is held constant, the importance placed on grades has only a small effect on cheating. But the important thing to note is that the patterns are

TABLE 5.15

Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and
Perceived Parental Evaluation of Good Grades

Perceived parental evaluation of good grades	Grade Average			
	B or higher	B- / C+	C or lower	% difference
Extremely important	41 (375)	52 (494)	57 (441)	-16
Quite important	41 (700)	52 (1,022)	57 (605)	-16
Fairly important	39 (534)	48 (669)	50 (426)	-11
% difference	+2	+4	+7	

quite different in the two tables. Students' assigning higher importance to good grades still acts as a deterrent to cheating even when grades are controlled, whereas the importance that parents attach to good grades continues to operate as a pressure to cheat when grades are held constant. When students place a high value on good grades, their actual performance has less bearing on their cheating than it does when they consider grades relatively unimportant. And the reverse holds true for perceived parental evaluation. If students think their parents consider grades extremely important, their chances of cheating are more closely tied to their academic standing than if they think their parents assign less importance to grades. Still another aspect of the interaction is suggested by the columns of the tables. When students do well in school, the evaluation that they or their parents place on grades has little effect on their likelihood of cheating. But when they do poorly in school, then their evaluation of good grades plays a part; poor students who themselves value good grades highly are deterred from cheating, and poor students whose parents value good grades are pressured to cheat.

The fact that the differences shown in the columns of Tables 5.14 and 5.15 are quite small stems in large part from the close association between self-evaluation of grades and that attributed to parents. We now know that these two variables have opposite effects on cheating; but, since they are associated, they tend to cross each other out. To completely unravel the significance of self-evaluations and parental evaluations of grades on cheating, it is necessary to examine all four variables simultaneously: the two evaluation measures, grades, and cheating. Our chief concern in examining these data is to see whether perceived parental evaluation of grades operates as a pressure to cheat even when grades and self-evaluation of grades are held constant. The interactions among these four variables can be seen in Table 5.16. (A warning is in order. Since we are examining four variables simultaneously, some of the case bases become quite small and so the percentages are not always reliable.)

Table 5.16 shows the relationship between importance of grades to parents and cheating under nine different conditions. By inspecting each column. we see that the general pattern tends to hold under most conditions: the more parents emphasize good grades, the more likely are students to cheat. The deviations from this pattern are also instructive. They tend to occur among the good students, those with B averages or higher. These students do not experience their parents' evaluations of grades as pressures to cheat; it is the average students and, particularly, the poor students who feel this pressure.

Although it is somewhat more difficult to see from the table, the student's own evaluation of grades serves to counteract this tendency. The poor students who think good grades are extremely important are

TABLE 5.16

Per Cent Cheating by Self-Evaluation of Grades, Parental Evaluation of Grades, and Grade Average

	Grade Average			
Students who consider grades extremely important	B or higher	B- / C+	C or lower	% difference
Parental Evaluation				
Extremely important	38 (238)	48 (270)	51 (226)	-13
Quite important	42 (255)	48 (207)	54 (125)	-12
Fairly important	36 (143)	51 (92)	40 (37)	- 4
Students Consider grades Quite Important				
Parental Evaluation				
Extremely important	49 (111)	53 (161)	60 (151)	-11
Quite important	40 (378)	54 (634)	56 (348)	-16
Fairly important	40 (256)	48 (310)	50 (157)	-10
Students Consider Grades Fairly Important				
Parental Evaluation				
Extremely important	38 (26)	67 (61)	68 (63)	-30
Quite important	45 (66)	63 (179)	64 (130)	-19
Fairly important	41 (134)	48 (310)	51 (231)	-10

not as prone to cheat in response to felt pressure from their parents as are students of similar ability who do not place much importance on grades. The highest proportion of cheaters (68 per cent) is found among the poor students who treat grades lightly but whose parents consider them to be important; the lowest proportions occur among the good students who place high value on good grades.

Finally, Table 5.16 helps us to understand the conditions under which academic performance relates to cheating. As can be seen by studying the rows of the Table, grades become more closely related to cheating when the value students place on them declines and when the value their parents place on them increases.

We began this chapter by showing that most students disapprove of cheating and that this attitude by itself is a major deterrent to academic dishonesty. We then sought to find out how academic performance is related to cheating. In particular, we wanted to see whether difficulties in performing the role of student would help us to understand why a number of students cheat even when they think cheating is wrong. We found that poor grades and poor study habits do operate as pressures to cheat, but that poor performance in the academic role only partly explains why some students deviate from their moral standards by cheating. The role of academic performance on cheating became clearer when we examined it in the context of the value that students and their parents place on doing well in school. We saw that students who place great importance on getting good grades are not, as we might have expected, more likely than others to cheat, even when they perform poorly. On the contrary, commitment to good grades acts as a constraint against cheating. But the value that parents are assumed to place on grades has the opposite effect. It operates as a pressure toward cheating, particularly among the poor students.

These "value" variables enabled us to specify the significance of academic performance for cheating. We saw that variations in performance were most relevant to cheating when students themselves treat grades lightly and when their parents take them most seriously.

In the next chapter we will explore in more detail the role that students' values--apart from their academic performance--play in academic dishonesty. In particular, we shall see how cheating is affected by the students' basic orientation to college.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Chapter 6

VALUE-ORIENTATIONS AND CHEATING

Students vary not only in their academic performance and intellectual capacities, but also in their basic orientations toward college and their purposes for being there. As was intimated in the previous chapters, not all students are equally committed to scholarship and the more serious aspects of college. It is well known that some students are more attracted by the social opportunities afforded them by college. They tend to see college as a place where one has a good time, not just as a place where one acquires an education. The main concern of this chapter will be to show how these variations in basic orientation affect cheating behavior. We shall employ data on the criteria students use in evaluating their peers to indicate where they stand along the continuum represented by educational and intellectual goals at one extreme and social goals at the other. We shall also look at their educational philosophy and the subjects they are majoring in as further indicators f their purposes for being in college. And, finally, we shall examine a number of indicators of their actual involvement in the social life of the college. Thus, in many respects, the analysis in this chapter complements that in the previous one, since students' orientations to college no doubt influence their performance in the classroom.

Orientation to the Intellectual and Social Aspects of College

With the data on hand, it is possible to develop several different measures of the relative importance students assign to the intellectual and social aspects of college. Particularly well suited for this purpose is a question that asks about the characteristics students consider important when evaluating their peers. The question was worded as follows: "How much does each of the following contribute to a student's standing in your eyes?" Two of the criteria provided reflect social values. These are "active social life, lots of dates" and "good personality, fun to be with." Two others reflect intellectual values: "interest in ideas and intellectual problems" and "appreciation of the arts." The importance students assign to these four criteria when evaluating their peers can be seen in Table 6.1.

TABLE 6.1

The Importance of Four Criteria for Evaluating other Students

	A Great Deal	A Fair Amount	Not Much	Not at All		
Active social life, lots of ideas	10%	37	39	14	100%	(5,352)
Good personality, fun to be with	62%	33	4	1	100%	(5,366)
Interest in ideas and intellectual problems	37%	47	14	2	100%	(5,368)
Appreciation of the arts	27%	45	24	4	100%	(5,363)

To construct our measure of orientation, we first made separate indices of the social and intellectual dimensions by combining the first two and the last two items. This was done by dichotomizing each item (to make groups as nearly equal as possible) and assigning a score of "1" to high importance and "0" to low importance. Thus, the two social criteria yield an index of social orientation with scores of 0, 1 and 2, and the two intellectual criteria yield a similar index of intellectual orientation. These two dimensions of orientation are analytically independent in that students may consider one, the other, both, or neither as important. And, in fact, they turn out to be empirically independent, since, when the two dimensions are crosstabulated, they show no correlation. The cross-classification of these two dimensions thus provides us with a typology of students' orientations to college. Table 6.2 shows how this typology of orientation is related to cheating.

TABLE 6.2

Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College

	Importance of Intellectual Values		
Importance of social values	High	Medium	Low
High	51 (747)	57 (607)	65 (548)
Medium	41 (827)	48 (609)	57 (576)
Low	37 (593)	40 (393)	47 (390)

Academic dishonesty is most prevalent among those who place high value on the social criteria and low value on the intellectual criteria; it is least prevalent among those who emphasize intellectual and de-emphasize social values. There is almost a 30-point difference in the per cent cheating between these two extreme types. It will be noted that both the social and intellectual dimensions contribute independently to the likelihood that a student will cheat. Emphasis on social values, controlling for intellectual values, is positively related to cheating, and emphasis on intellectual values, controlling for the social dimension, is negatively related to cheating. The typology can be reduced to a continuum by considering only the relative primacy given to the two dimensions. It can be seen that the level of cheating increases with each step from primary emphasis on intellectual values to primary emphasis on social values (from lower left to upper right of Table 6.2). Thus, by incorporating both dimensions of values into our measure of orientation, instead of depending on one or the other alone, we have a broader assessment of students' orientations, one that shows a strong association with cheating.

It is not difficult to speculate about why cheating should be associated with an emphasis on the social values at the expense of intellectual ones. Students who place more value on the social aspects of college are not likely to spend much time on their studies and so are apt to be in academic difficulty. Conversely, students who emphasize intellectual matters are not only likely to be more serious about their studies, they probably also have more respect for the "rules of the game," which define cheating as wrong. Later in this chapter we shall explore in some detail how value-orientations are linked to academic dishonesty.

We have been careful to explain this particular measure of orientation because we shall make use of it later in the analysis. Our immediate task, however, is to consider other measures of commitment to the social and intellectual aspects of college. If orientation is indeed relevant to academic dishonesty, then other indicators of orientation should show relationships with cheating similar to those in Table 6.2.

Students' degree of commitment to intellectual values can be inferred from their responses to a question about the most important purpose of a college education. They were presented with six options, including development of their social skills, occupational preparation, and acquiring basic education and appreciation for ideas. Table 6.3 shows how these purposes are related to cheating.

TABLE 6.3

Per Cent Cheating by Purpose of College Education Considered Most Important

Purposes of college education	% cheating	
Develop my ability to get along with different kinds of people	54	(551)
Provide vocational training; develop skills and techniques directly applicable to my career	52	(1,744)
Prepare me for a happy marriage and family life	52	(231)
Develop my knowledge and interest in community and world problems	46	(159)
Help develop my moral capacities, ethical standards and values	45	(360)
Provide a basic general education and appreciation of ideas	45	(2,158)

The first three items, referring to social skills, occupation, and family life, have little to do with strictly academic or intellectual concerns. Students who see these as the most important goals of their education are not valuing education in its own right, but only as a means to some other end. And, as can be seen from the table, they are somewhat more likely to cheat than the students who single out the last three items, which indicate that education is being valued as an end in itself. And so, once again, we find that a distinction between academic and non-academic concerns is related to cheating.

This conclusion rests on the assumption that the purposes students attribute to higher education reflect their basic orientation to college;

that is, whether they give primacy to the social or intellectual aspects of college life. This seems plausible for two of the goals--developing social skills and obtaining a general education and appreciation for ideas. But what about the other items in Table 6.3? Are we correct in assuming that the first three are more apt to reflect the social orientation and the last three the intellectual orientation? The answer is provided in Table 6.4.

TABLE 6.4

Orientation to College by Purpose of College Education Considered Most Important

	Orientation to College[a]				
	Primarily Intellectual	Neither/ both	Social	Totals	
Most important purpose of college education					
Developing ability to get along with people	27%	34	39	100%	(540)
Provide vocational training	25%	35	40	100%	(1,720)
Preparation for happy marriage and family life	21%	35	44	100%	(228)
Develop knowledge and interest in community and world problems	47%	31	22	100%	(157)
Develop moral capacities, ethical standards, moral values	45%	30	25	100%	(354)
Provide basic education and appreciation for ideas	43%	31	26	100%	(2,121)

---

[a] This index of orientation has been constructed from the typology shown in Table 6.2. The primarily intellectual group consists of those in the three cells below the main diagonal; the primarily social group, of those in the three cells above the main diagonal; and the mixed group, of those along the main diagonal.

Our expectation is clearly borne out by the data. Students who give primary importance to developing their interpersonal skills, occupational training, or preparation for marriage are more likely to have a social orientation to college; students choosing any of the last three items, in contrast, are more likely to have an intellectual orientation.

The base figures in Table 6.4 indicate that, by far, the two most popular purposes of a college education are occupational training and acquiring a basic general education and appreciation of ideas. Students holding these differing values are apt to choose different fields of study. No doubt, those who view college mainly as occupational training are more likely to pursue courses of study that have a more immediate pay-off in terms of a carrer, such as business, engineering, and teacher training, whereas those who see college primarily in intellectual terms are more often to be found in fields like the humanities or history, which have much less relevance as occupational training.

We may thus view major field of study as yet another indicator of students' commitment to the intellectual life. If this is true, we should find that choice of field is also related to cheating. That this is the case is shown in Table 6.5.

The fields of study have been ordered in the table according to the proportion of students in them who cheat, and the results bear out our expectations fairly well. Students in the most clearly career-oriented fields, business, engineering, and education are much more likely to cheat than students majoring in history, the humanities, or languages. In between fall the students majoring in the social and physical sciences and the art fields. These categories no doubt include both

TABLE 6.5

Per Cent Cheating by Major Field of Concentration

Major field	% cheating
Business and commerce	66 (367)
Engineering	58 (367)
Education	52 (761)
Social science	52 (886)
Fine and applied arts	50 (535)
Physical science	47 (835)
History and area studies	43 (389)
Humanities	39 (605)
Language	37 (211)

students who are seeking occupational training and those who are more interested in knowledge for its own sake. The relevance of occupational plans and values for cheating behavior in college merits further attention in subsequent analysis. For the purposes of this report, however, even the crude classification of major field shown in Table 6.4 is sufficient to show that the values expressed in this choice are relevant to academic dishonesty.

Involvement in Campus Social Life and Cheating

So far, we have shown that students' values concerning the social and intellectual aspects of college have a bearing on their propensity to cheat. This fundamental orientation to college affects students' decisions about a variety of matters, such as their field of study, the kinds of people they want as friends, and the kinds of activities to which they are willing to devote their time. Students who give primacy to social values should devote more of their time to purely social activities. And, indeed, our data show this to be so. We have information on how frequently the students date, how many hours a week they spend "having a few drinks" with their friends, watching television, or playing cards, and whether they are members of those institutions that symbolize campus social life, the fraternity and sorority. In every instance, our basic measure of value-orientation is related to these social activities. But, surprisingly enough, these relationships are not very strong. For example, 46 per cent of the socially oriented arrange dates with the opposite sex at least once a week compared with 40 per cent of the intellectually oriented; 51 per cent of the social oriented belong to fraternities or sororities, compared with 39 per cent of the intellectually oriented; and 47 per cent of the former spend some time each week drinking with friends compared with 38 per cent of the latter. (In every instance, those with a mixed orientation fall in between.) The consistency of these results indicates that value-orientation is an element affecting students' involvement in campus social life, but it is equally clear from the small correlations that involvement in social life is to a considerable extent, independent of this value-orientation. Since the students' behavior and their value-orientations are by no means the same thing, we shall now look into how these behavioral items relate to cheating.

Two questions were asked concerning the frequency of dating: how often students have prearranged evening meetings and how often they have spur-of-the-moment get-togethers with members of the opposite sex. We felt that it would be important to make this distinction between formal and informal dating because the former involves planning and hence is more likely to be integrated with the students' other activities, notably his studies. But, as can be seen from Table 6.6, both forms of dating, when carried out frequently, are positively related to cheating.

TABLE 6.6

Per Cent Cheating by Frequency of Prearranged Evening Dates and Frequency of Informal Spur-of-the-Moment Dates

Frequency	Prearranged dates		Spur-of-the-Moment Dates	
Not at all	44	(391)	44	(818)
Once a month or less	45	(1,182)	45	(1,396)
Two or three times a month	50	(1,396)	52	(1,093)
Once a week	52	(1,481)	55	(725)
More than that	52	(489)	54	(570)

It should be noted that the students who never date at all and those who date infrequently show practically the same rate of cheating. The proportion of cheaters only increases among those who date often, the students who presumably are placing their social life ahead of their studies. It may also be noted that the cheaters are slightly more prevalent among those who have frequent unplanned dates. These are probably the students who are easily distracted from their studies, those who lack discipline.

Just as socializing frequently with the opposite sex is associated with cheating, so is having frequent social contacts with members of one's own sex, as indicated by time spent playing cards and drinking with friends. These relationships are shown in Table 6.7.

On many campuses, social life centers upon the fraternities and sororities. These institutions embody the social values we have been speaking about. Apart from the values that fraternity membership may express, there are other respects in which fraternities may be relevant

TABLE 6.7

Per Cent Cheating by Time Spent During Average Week Watching TV and Playing Cards or Drinking with Friends

	% cheating
Time spent watching TV or playing cards	
None	41 (1,666)
One to four hours	51 (1,953)
Five or more hours	56 (1,447)
Time spent having a few drinks with other students	
None	43 (2,780)
One or more hours	58 (2,013)

to the incidence of academic dishonesty. The fraternity or sorority provides certain advantages of organization that nonmembers cannot avail themselves of. Some fraternities and sororities have old term papers and exams on file, which serve as temptations for some and opportunities for others to engage in academic dishonesty. Moreover, the spirit of loyalty among the "brothers" or "sisters" that prevails in these organizations may have the effect of protecting those members who are not above resorting to dishonesty in their academic work. This loyalty may even extend to conspiring in academic dishonesty with their fellow members. For these reasons, we might expect that membership in a greek letter society is related to cheating, and Table 6.8 shows that this is so.

The more closely students are associated with a fraternity or sorority the more likely they are to cheat. Interestingly enough, this principle extends even to nonmembers, for the students who are at

TABLE 6.8

Per Cent Cheating by Affiliation with a Social Fraternity or Sorority

	% cheating	
There are no fraternities or sororities on campus	46	(2,326)
There are fraternities or sororities but the student has not been affiliated	49	(1,663)
The student has been affiliated	52	(1,014)
The student lives in a fraternity or sorority house	61	(344)

schools that have no fraternities or sororities are less prone to cheat than those who do not belong but attend schools that do have greek letter societies. These nonmembers, in turn, cheat less than those who belong but do not live in a fraternity or sorority house, and the group most prone to cheat are those who actually live in the fraternity or sorority house. In fact, living in the fraternity or sorority house makes more of a difference than just belonging. This pattern of results is a reminder that cheating is not only an individual phenomenon but a social one as well. One clue that a form of behavior is sanctioned by a social group is that it is more likely to be manifested by the people most deeply involved in the group.[1] Thus, Table 6.7 suggests that cheating is more likely to be tolerated by fraternities and sororities.

---

[1] See Edward A. Suchman and Herbert Menzel, "The Interplay of Demographic and Psychological Variables in Voting Surveys," in P.F. Lazarsfeld and M. Rosenberg, eds. The Language of Social Research, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955) pp. 148-54.

Orientation to College, Disapproval of Cheating, and Grades

In the last chapter, we explored the interaction of two attributes of students as they related to cheating, their academic standing and their moral position on cheating. We looked at grades to see if they would help explain why some students cheat even though they think cheating is wrong. We can now raise a similar question in connection with the student's orientation toward college. It may be that students cheat even though they disapprove of cheating because they hold other values that sooner or later come into conflict with their views on cheating. Since students who are oriented toward campus social life are more likely to neglect their studies than the students who are not so oriented, it may well be that personal disapproval of cheating loses its effectiveness as a deterrant for these students. It may even be that they are more tolerant of cheating because, as students prone to academic difficulty, they need to resort to this form of behavior more. This reasoning implies that the more socially oriented do in fact disapprove less and have a lower academic standing than the more intellectually oriented students. Before examining the interaction of these elements and cheating, let us see if these assumptions are correct. Table 6.9 shows how orientation to college is related to disapproval of cheating and academic standing.

TABLE 6.9

Orientation to College as Related to Disapproval of Cheating and Grade Average

Orientation	% who strongly disapprove of cheating	% with high grade average (B or higher)
Primarily intellectual	43 (1,779)	39 (1,771)
Neither/Both	40 (1,715)	31 (1,746)
Primarily social	33 (1,687)	21 (1,727)

The data show that both our expectations hold: the students characterized by a primarily social orientation are not as likely to score high on the disapproval index and do not generally do as well in their studies as those with primarily an intellectual orientation to college. But it may also be noted that the relationship with disapproval is not strong; the socially oriented are only somewhat more likely to be tolerant of cheating than the intellectually oriented. Their greater tendency to cheat, then, is not likely to be explained away by their moral position on this issue. The relationship with grades is considerably more pronounced. The intellectually oriented are almost twice as likely to be high in academic standing as the socially oriented.

With these relationships in mind, let us now see what happens to the connection between orientation and cheating when these other variables are considered. Table 6.10 shows the joint effects of orientation and disapproval on cheating behavior.

TABLE 6.10

Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College
and Attitude Toward Cheating

	Orientation			
Disapproval index	Primarily intellectual	Neither/Both	Primarily Social	% Difference
High (very strong)	29 (769)	35 (681)	41 (557)	-11
Medium (moderate)	40 (702)	53 (705)	63 (734)	-23
Low (weak)	69 (308)	74 (329)	81 (396)	-11
% Difference	-40	-39	-40	

The first thing to be noted in Table 6.10 is that personal attitude toward cheating continues to be strongly related to cheating, whatever the student's orientation to college. Unlike the influence of grades on disapproval (see Table 5.5), orientation to college does not intensify the effect of disapproval: its correlation with cheating is equally strong in all orientation groups. But disapproval does have an effect on the role played by orientation.

Orientation is related to cheating even when disapproval is held constant. The top row of Table 6.10 shows that the socially oriented are somewhat more likely to cheat than the intellectually oriented even when they share the same strong moral aversion to this form of behavior. Thus social values do place some strain on honesty values. But it also is valid to turn this statement around and say that strong moral disapproval of cheating serves to place reins on the cheating tendencies of the socially oriented. When moral disapproval is low (the third row), orientation again only has a moderate effect, but this time it is because most students tend to cheat, even the intellectually oriented ones. Orientation to college has its strongest effect among those in the middle disapproval group. When the anticheating attitude is held with only moderate intensity, orientation becomes a more decisive determinant of whether or not the student will cheat.

One final thing may be noted about Table 6.10. Just as when we examined the interaction of grades and disapproval, so now we find that orientation and disapproval account for a great deal of the variance in cheating. This can be seen by comparing the cheating tendencies of the two extreme groups, the intellectually oriented who strongly disapprove of cheating and the socially oriented whose disapproval is weak. Again we find a difference of some 52 percentage points.

The possible interaction of academic standing and orientation to college on cheating remains to be seen. We know that each of these variables is related to cheating and that they are related to each other. In trying to understand why a social orientation to college is related to cheating we have suggested that, possibly, the intervening link is the poor academic performance of the socially oriented. If this is the sole basis for the relationship, then we should find that orientation is not related to cheating when grades are held constant. But this is by no means the case as can be seen from Table 6.11.

TABLE 6.11

Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College and Grade Average

	Orientation			
Grade Average	Primarily intellectual	Neither/Both	Primarily social	% Difference
High (A and B-)	36 (702)	42 (539)	48 (369)	-12
Medium (B- and C+)	43 (708)	51 (731)	62 (747)	-19
Low (C or lower)	41 (381)	55 (476)	63 (511)	-22
% difference	- 5	-13	-15	

Both orientation to college and grades have independent effects on cheating, since each is related to cheating when the other is held constant. Of particular interest, however, is the interaction of these variables. Grades turn out to have a mediating role in the relationship between orientation and cheating; similarly, the relationship between grades and cheating turns out to depend largely on the student's orientation to college. Orientation becomes more important as academic standing declines, and grades are more relevant among the socially oriented than among the intellectually oriented. On balance, orientation seems to be more important than grades, as can be seen by comparing the percentage differences in the rows with those in the columns.

With these findings we close our analysis of the role of orientation to college on the propensity to cheat. We have seen that students who are primarily socially oriented more often cheat. This is true whether we differentiate students on the basis of their values or on the basis of their actual behavior on campus, that is, their participation in college social life. Conversely, students who are primarily oriented to the intellectual life of college, as expressed by their criteria for judging peers, their educational philosophy and their choice of major, are not as prone to cheat.

Having demonstrated the importance of orientation, we then examined its relationship to the attributes that, in the previous chapter, we found to be important--moral stance on cheating and academic standing. We saw that all three of these variables independently relate to cheating. Not surprisingly, moral position on cheating proves to have the strongest effect, followed by orientation to college and, finally, grades. As we saw in the last chapter, grades become more or less relevant to cheating depending on how much importance students and their parents place on getting good grades.

Although these variables are independently related to cheating, we have seen that they also interact, modifying and intensifying the effect that any one of them has on academic dishonesty. Since moral stance, academic performance, and orientation to college are related to each other, we can think of these variables as delineating the personality of the cheater. He is generally a person of below average ability (or at least performance), who is oriented to the social rather than intellectual aspects of college, and who does not take a strong stand against cheating.

One question that arises from this portrait of the cheater concerns the processes through which the "cheating syndrome" develops. Do students begin to cheat solely because of the pressures they encounter in college, or do they manifest this trait at an earlier stage in their educational experience. Do students perform poorly because they are socially oriented or do they become socially oriented after they become disillusioned with their academic performance? Gathering data at only one point in time, unlike a panel study, provides little basis for sorting out these variables and reconstructing the sequence of their development. Some approximation of a panel study, however, can be made through retrospective questions, questions asking the respondent to report how things were at an earlier point in time. A set of such questions was asked the students in our sample about their behavior in high school. And so, although we cannot reconstruct too well the cheating process as it develops in college, we can at least examine students' reports of their behavior in high school to see whether the "cheating syndrome" has its roots in this earlier phase of the educational process. It is to this task that we turn in the next chapter.

Chapter 7

HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND CHEATING

In high school, students are supposed to develop interests and capabilities that prepare them for college or for taking their place in the occupational world. The high school itself serves as a kind of proving ground where students demonstrate to themselves and to others, largely through their success in coping with academic requirements, that they have the capacity for the work they plan to pursue.

But for most students, high school is much more than academic requirements and pressures. As they become adolescents and enter high school, students begin to move away from the influence of their parents and to adopt standards of conduct and patterns of behavior common among their peers. The youth culture into which they emerge provides them with new guidelines for recognition and respect. They come to identify those students who are members of the "leading crowd," and they learn what one must do in order to win and hold this respected position in adolescent society. As several studies, notably one by Coleman, have shown,[1] all too often the values and patterns of behavior held in high esteem in the adolescent society are at odds with the primary objectives of education. Instead of rewarding academic work, adolescent society tends to reward social activity, with athletics and frequent dating serving as avenues to status in the peer group.

---

[1] See James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), and August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949).

It is quite possible, then, that the kind of orientation students have toward college, which we have seen is linked to their cheating behavior, develops in the high school setting and that it is in high school that students first learn to cheat. We might certainly expect this to be true if every high school student went on to college, but, of course, that is not the case. Only half of the high school graduates in this country go on to college and many people who start high school never finish, much less enter college. If the high school peer culture is as antithetical to educational values as some investigators would have us suppose, then it is unlikely that students deeply immersed in the high school culture would go to college. In short, although the same syndrome of low grades, social orientation, and cheating may characterize students who cheat in high school, it is not at all clear that the people in our special sample of ex-high-school-students--those now in college--behaved this way when they were in high school.

In this chapter we investigate the facts of the matter, using the retrospective questions that asked students about their orientation when in high school, their academic performance in high school, and whether they cheated in high school. We shall see whether orientation and performance are linked to cheating in high school, and whether high school experiences are linked to the attributes students have in college. By using these pseudo-panel data we shall try to find out how stable these characteristics are and we shall attempt to unravel the connections among them.

The Cheating Syndrome in High School

Irrespective of their current value-orientation in college, were most of the students in our sample primarily oriented to academic matters while in high school? Did they shun the "leading crowds" in high school, which presumably symbolize social values at the expense of academic ones? Contrary to what the theory of the adolescent society would lead us to expect, we shall see that this is not the case. These college students were probably more likely than most of their peers in high school to have been in the leading crowd, and many of them did not shy away from social concerns.

To show this, we must have some way of measuring their orientation when they were in high school. College orientations were classified on the basis of the criteria students apply when evaluating their fellow students. Unfortunately, we must use a different, although in many ways comparable, classification of their high school orientations.

Respondents were asked to compare themselves with their high school peers in four respects: participation in athletics, dating, "stirring up excitement," and "taking an interest in studies and making good grades." They could reply to each item by indicating, "more than others," "about the same as others," or "less than others." The first three items refer to behavior held in high esteem by the youth culture and tap the social dimension of orientation; the last item, about interest in studies, taps the academic dimension or what we called, in the college context, the intellectual dimension. We have characterized students as having manifested the social dimension of orientation if they indicated "more than others" in response to any of the first three items; the academic dimension, if they gave this response to the fourth item, dealing with interest in studies.

As in the case of college orientation, these two dimensions are almost totally independent of each other and, again, we have developed a typology of orientation. The distribution of students according to this typology of their high school orientation is shown in Table 7.1.

TABLE 7.1

Distribution of Students According to Typology of High School Orientations

Type of orientation	No.	%
Academically oriented only	1,608	30%
Academically and socially oriented	1,276	24
Socially oriented only	1,013	19
Neither academically or socially oriented	1,466	27
	5,363	100%

As might be expected of high school graduates who went on to college, a slight majority felt that they were more interested in studies than the typical student in their high school (the first two orientations types). In fact, the pure academic turns out to be the most frequent type of orientation and the pure social the least frequent type. Nonetheless, almost half these college students also felt that, in at least one or more of the three matters dealing with the social orientation, they were more involved than most students in their high school. (This proportion is arrived at by combining the second and third categories in the table.) In short, their interest in studies notwithstanding, many of these college students were not alienated from the adolescent culture of their high schools.

This is seen more vividly when we consider their responses to the question of whether they were members of their "leading crowd" in their high school. More than half the students--55 per cent--felt that they were members of the leading crowd in their high school, 29 per cent were convinced that they were not, and some 16 per cent were not sure. Since this status must be an exclusive one if it is to have prestige, we can safely assume that the proportion in the leading crowd in any high school is much smaller than 55 per cent. It is quite possible that a number of students misperceive their former status in high school society, thinking they were in the leading crowd or that their crowd was the leading one, when in fact this was not the case. But the proportion who feel they had been in the leading crowd of their high school is so large that it seems likely that factors other than misperception are at work. It would appear that colleges disproportionately recruit students from this group of high school leaders. Perhaps, then, there is not as much discontinuity between the youth culture and higher education as some have supposed. But what were the orientations of the students who had been in the leading crowd? Are these crowds as antiacademic in high school as Coleman suggests? Table 7.2, showing the proportion of those with each orientation who felt that they were in the leading crowd, provides the answer.

TABLE 7.2

Per Cent of Students Who Were Members of the Leading Crowd in Their High School by Orientation in High School

High school orientation	% of students in leading crowd
Academically and socially oriented	86 (1,276)
Socially oriented only	76 (1,013)
Academic oriented only	37 (1,608)
Neither academically nor socially oriented	28 (1,406)

We see from these data that the adolescent society does provide only modest rewards for academic endeavor. The kind of orientation that is most closely associated with membership in the leading crowd combines both academic and social accomplishments. But by comparing the various orientations, we see that it is the social dimension that makes by far the greater contribution. Those who are only socially oriented are almost as likely as those who are both to be leading crowd members. In fact, having the social orientation alone increases the likelihood of being in the leading crowd by roughly 50 percentage points (76 per cent minus 28 per cent representing those who have neither orientation), whereas having the academic orientation alone increases the probability by only 10 percentage points. The social orientation is almost a prerequisite of leading crowd status and the academic dimension helps only a little.

We now see, then, that Coleman's image of the adolescent society has much merit. Our sample of college students may well be deviant from the typical high school pattern in that they tend to supplement their social orientation, which provides them with status in the high school society, with an academic orientation, which insures that they will meet the requirements of college entrance. The data also suggest that many colleges tend to reward those in the leading high school crowd, preferring applicants who are "well-rounded" and not just academically oriented.

Having seen that college students are no strangers to the socially oriented leading crowds of high school, will we find that high school orientation is linked to high school cheating? And to what extent do the orientations that students develop in high school carry over to the college period? Are their college orientations shaped by their status in the adolescent society of high school or are they shaped by very different forces operating on the college campus? The answer to the latter questions is provided by Table 7.3, which shows the connection between high school orientation and college orientation.

TABLE 7.3

Relationship Between High School Orientation and Orientation in College

College orientation	Academic only	Academic and social	Neither academic nor social	Social only
Primarily intellectual	44%	32%	32%	25%
Neither/both	32%	34	33	31
Primarily social	24	34	35	44
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(1,574)	(1,253)	(1,367)	(989)

Those who were only academically oriented in high school are much more likely to manifest the same orientation in college (we have used a different name for the corresponding college orientation although the concept is much the same), than those who were only socially oriented. Conversely, the socially oriented in high school are much more apt than the others to have a social orientation in college. Those with mixed orientations or neither orientation fall between these extremes.

Both methodological and substantive conclusions follow from this correlation. Methodologically, the findings in Table 7.3 provide some reassurance that our two measures of orientation, although constructed from different indicators, deal with much the same set of concepts. Substantively, we learn that there is a tendency for students' orientations in college to be molded by their high school experiences. But although there is much stability in orientation, we also see from Table 7.3 that there is a good deal of change. About a fourth of those whose orientation was academic in high school have shifted to a primarily social orientation in college, and about the same proportion make the reverse shift from a social orientation in high school to an intellectual one in college. (Those with mixed orientations or neither orientation in high school are the most unstable; they are just as likely to end up intellectually oriented as socially oriented in college.)

Before we can consider whether the "cheating syndrome" found in college was also manifested in high school, we must come to grips with a prior issue: how much cheating did these college students do in high school and how does it compare with the amount of cheating they now do in college? At first glance, we might expect that these students cheat more in college than they did in high school. After all, they tended to be in the academic elite of their high schools or else they would not have been accepted in college, and so they should not have had much need to cheat in high school. Once in college, however, they are faced with more stringent academic demands and more competitive pressures from peers who are more their equal in academic ability, factors that might well lead them to take up cheating for the first time. But, however plausible this expectation may be, the facts of the matter are quite different. By their own reports, the students were somewhat more prone to cheat in high school than in college. This finding emerges even though our measures of cheating in the two situations are not identical. Our measure of college cheating, it will be remembered, is based on four forms of dishonesty, including plagiarism as well as cheating on tests or exams. Our measure of high school cheating, in contrast, refers only to cheating on tests or exams.[2] But even though our measure of college cheating covers more situations, we find that some 53 per cent of these students cheated in high school, compared with 51 per cent in college. When we consider only the two items that refer to cheating on tests or exams in college (using crib-notes and copying from someone else during a test or exam), the proportion of cheaters in college decreases to 33 per cent compared with 53 per cent for the comparable kind of cheating in high school. However widespread the deviation from norms of academic honesty may be in college, the situation is apparently even worse in high school. And since our picture of high school students is based on the more academically oriented group--those who go on to college--our findings probably understate the situation.

As we have seen, many of these college students were members in good standing in the high school adolescent society, whose culture de-emphasizes academic endeavor and presumably treats cheating lightly. Thus the decrease in cheating that occurs with the transition from high school to college is perhaps best explained by the shift from the adolescent culture to the more serious-minded peer culture of college. This theory, which assumes that students' tendencies to cheat are restrained or reinforced by the norms and values of the peer groups to which they belong, is examined in some detail in the next chapter.

---

[2] The question read: "When you were in high school, about how often did you cheat on tests or exams? Never, Once, A few times, Several times, Often."

Since high school orientation is related to college orientation, we might expect that it bears the same kind of relationship to high school cheating as college orientation does to college cheating. Table 7.4 shows this to be so.

TABLE 7.4

Per Cent Cheating in High School by
High School Orientation

High school orientation	% cheating in high school	
Academically oriented only	42	(1,607)
Academically and socially oriented	52	(1,272)
Neither academically nor socially oriented	54	(1,380)
Socially oriented only	68	(1,406)

The relationship between high school orientation and high school cheating is even stronger than the comparable relationship in college (see Table 6.2). And, just as in Table 7.3, we see that those with both orientations and those with neither behave quite similarly, falling between the academically oriented and the socially oriented.

The other component of the "cheating syndrome" in college for which comparable data exist on the high school level is academic performance. From Table 7.5, we see that high school performance, like orientation, is closely related to high school cheating, somewhat more so than the comparable relationship on the college level. That cheating tends to be part of the high school way of life is suggested by the fact that a substantial proportion (two out of five) of even the best students engaged in cheating.

TABLE 7.5

Per Cent Cheating in High School by High School Grade Average

High School grade average	% cheating in high school	
A	41	(718)
A-	47	(959)
B+	52	(1,315)
B	54	(920)
B-	59	(609)
C+ or lower	64	(884)

We now know that the cheating syndrome manifested in college appears at the still earlier stage of high school. The college students who had been drawn into the adolescent culture of their high schools were apt to perform poorly and engage in cheating while in high school.[3] On the basis of this evidence, we might assume that the pattern of academic dishonesty learned in high school carries over to the college situation. In other words, the high school setting would seem to provide a training ground for college cheating. This presupposes that there is a strong connection between high school cheating and college cheating. This relationship appears in Table 7.6.

---

[3] We should note that high school orientation is even more closely related to performance than is college orientation. Among students academically oriented, irrespective of whether they were socially oriented, slightly more than 75 per cent had B averages or higher in high school, compared with 30 per cent of those who lacked an academic orientation. This close association no doubt stems from the fact that our indicator of academic orientation in high school is more closely tied to studies and grades than are the indicators of the comparable orientation in college. In short, these students tend to be accurate reporters when they say that they did not take more of an interest in studies and grades than other students in their high school.

TABLE 7.6

The Relationship Between Cheating in High School and Cheating in College[a]

	High School Cheating	
College cheating	yes	no
yes	64%	33%
no	36	67
	100% (2,845)	100% (5,524)

[a]College cheating is measured by our standard index, which, as we have noted, is more inclusive than the measure of high school cheating.

The data show that cheating in high school is quite strongly related to cheating in college. This is, of course, not surprising, especially in view of the stability of the "cheating syndrome" of poor grades and a primarily social orientation. But equally important are the two deviant groups in Table 7.6, those who stopped cheating once they left high school and those who only took up cheating once they got to college. The frequency of these various types is more easily seen in Table 7.7, in which the data of the previous table are percentaged on the basis of the total sample.

TABLE 7.7

The Distribution of Students According to Their Cheating History

High School	College	%	No.
Cheater	Cheater	34	1,817
Cheater	Noncheater	19	1,028
Noncheater	Cheater	15	821
Noncheater	Noncheater	32	1,703
		100%	5,369

As can be seen from Table 7.7, the proportion of students who give up cheating when they get to college is somewhat greater than the proportion who take it up for the first time. This difference would be even greater if we used exactly comparable measures of cheating at both times, for the measure of college cheating is more inclusive than that of high school cheating. In the remainder of this chapter, we shall analyze these differing cheating careers. In particular, we shall try to see if changes in cheating behavior are related to changes in academic performance and value-orientation.

Academic Performance Patterns and Cheating Career

We already know that cheating in high school is strongly related to cheating in college. But is this simply because poor students are more prone to cheat in both situations? We might suppose that students who perform better in college than they did in high school will be the ones who stop cheating when they get to college, whereas students who encounter academic difficulty for the first time in college will be prone to start cheating if they had not already done so in high school. To the extent that this pattern occurs, we should find little relationship between high school cheating and college cheating independent of the student's pattern of academic performance. But, as we shall see, this expectation does not fully hold. Although pattern of performance does affect college cheating, it does not wash out the effect of high school cheating. Before showing all the relevant data, we first consider the effect of college performance alone on the relationship between high school cheating and college cheating. This is done in Table 7.8.

TABLE 7.8

Per Cent Cheating in College by College Grades and High School Cheating

	High School Cheating	
College grades	Yes	No
B or higher	56 (770)	27 (849)
B- / C+	66 (1,141)	36 (1,050)
C or lower	68 (894)	35 (582)

The first column shows the per cent of college cheaters among those who cheated in high school; the second, the per cent of college cheaters among those who did not cheat in high school. By reading across each row, we see that prior history of cheating makes a marked difference in college cheating whatever the academic performance of the student in college. These differences are much larger than those shown in the columns. Even the high school cheaters who are doing well in college are much more prone to cheat than the high school noncheaters who are doing poorly in college. The data clearly indicate that the cheating habit, once learned, is apt to persist even when academic performance would seem to make it unnecessary.

At the same time, we see that college performance does have some effect on habits learned in high school. Thus, the students who cheated in high school and are now doing well in college are more likely to have stopped cheating than the high school cheaters who are doing poorly in college. And poor college performance does produce some strain toward cheating on students who managed to avoid academic dishonesty in high school, since in this group cheating increases somewhat as grades go down.

One other thing may be noted in Table 7.8. There are pressures in college to give up cheating or to take it up apart from academic performance. Some 27 per cent of the students doing well in college who did not cheat in high school are now cheating, and some 32 per cent of the high school cheaters with a low academic standing nonetheless have stopped cheating.

Since Table 7.8 deals with college performance alone, we cannot tell from it whether change in academic performance between high school and college is important to college cheating. To show this we must not only examine cheating at both times but performance at both times as well. Table 7.9 presents these data.

Table 7.9 is quite complex; it shows how high school cheating, high school performance, and college performance each affects college cheating. A careful reading of the table shows that each of these variables has some independent effect on college cheating, but by far the most important of these is high school cheating. As can be seen by comparing the columns, the cheating habit, once acquired in high school, is apt to persist, no matter what the academic performance of the student in high school or college. Even the consistently good students (those with high grades in both institutions) are more prone to cheat in college if they had cheated in high school than the consistently bad students who had refrained from cheating in high school. College grades have an effect, but a much smaller one, as can be seen by reading down the columns within each of the three parts of the table. The crucial distinction in college is between the students with a B average or higher and those with lower grades, since those with low grade averages differ little from those with medium averages.

TABLE 7.9

Per Cent Cheating in College by College Academic Performance, High School Academic Performance, and High School Cheating

		% Cheating in High School	
		Yes	No
High School Grades Were High (A, A-)[a]			
College grades are	High (B or higher)	54 (392)	25 (495)
	Medium (B-/C-)	61 (259)	35 (315)
	Low (C or lower)	62 (85)	36 (91)
High School Grades Were Medium (B+, B, B-)			
College grades are	High	56 (323)	30 (327)
	Medium	67 (670)	35 (212)
	Low	65 (516)	33 (347)
High School Grades Were Low (C+ or lower)			
College grades are	High	67 ((55)	15 (26)
	Medium	70 (212)	44 (134)
	Low	74 (293)	40 (144)

[a] Somewhat different cutting points were used to establish high, medium, and low grades in high school than in college since these students were much more apt to have had high grades in high school.

Interestingly enough, high school performance also has some effect on college cheating independently of the other two variables. But this turns out to be a rather strange, conditional influence. Among students who were cheaters in high school (the first column), those with good high school grades were more likely to give up cheating in college than those with poor high school grades. This pattern holds on every level of college grades. For example, only 54 per cent of the "A" students in high school with a high academic standing in college are still cheating compared with 67 per cent of the "C" students in high school who are doing well in college. And the high school cheaters who did well in high school but are now doing poorly in college are cheating less in college than the high school cheaters whose academic record has been consistently poor (62 per cent compared with 74 per cent). This consistent pattern is just the opposite of what we should find if the student's academic record by itself influenced college cheating. Since these are all students who learned to cheat in high school, we might expect that those who are performing better in college than they did in high school would stop cheating with greater frequency than those whose college performance is below their high school performance.

That the reverse is true is yet another reminder that the sources of college cheating do not lie wholly within the individual student. As we shall show in the subsequent chapters, the kind of college the student is attending and the values of his college peers are important influences. In this instance, the seemingly anomalous pattern might very well be explained by the fact that the good high school students attend quite different colleges than the poor high school students. When they arrive on campus they may well be exposed to greater pressures to "reform," even though they may have academic difficulty.

Before leaving Table 7.9 we should note the effect of high school grades on college cheating among those who did not develop the cheating habit in high school. In this group there is little difference between those with high and medium high school grades. Those with low high school grades who are not doing very well in college are somewhat more likely to take up cheating in college than those with similar college grades who did better in high school. This finding too, might be explained by differences in schools attended. The strikingly different group among the high school noncheaters is also found among those who did poorly in high school. These are the students who are performing much better in college than they did in high school. Unfortunately, their number is so small that we cannot place too much confidence in the percentage figure. And yet, it is of interest that these students are least likely to cheat in college of any of the groups shown in Table 7.9. These late bloomers, more than any other group in the table, conform to the expectations based on performance history. That they have performed far better than their high school record would indicate suggests that factors other than ability underlie their poor high school performance. Perhaps they knew that their high school grades did not reflect their ability and perhaps they resisted the pressure to cheat in high school for this reason. In any case, these unusual students show the smallest proportion of converts to cheating in college.

Value-Orientation Patterns and Cheating Career

If grades are in large part a reflection of students' abilities, then their value-orientations are in large part a reflection of their peer groups. We have already seen that the socially oriented students were more likely to have held high status in the adolescent society of high school and that they were more prone to cheat in high school. To what extent do value-orientations and changes in them account for cheating in college independently of high school cheating? As in the case of academic performance, we shall proceed by first examining the effect of college orientation on the relationship between high school and college cheating and then consider the simultaneous effects of high school and college orientation. Table 7.10 shows how college orientation relates to college cheating when high school cheating is taken into account.

TABLE 7.10

Per Cent Cheating in College by College Orientation and High School Cheating

College Orientation	High School Cheating Yes	No
Intellectual	55 (874)	25 (941)
Both/Neither	63 (894)	35 (853)
Social	72 (1,041)	40 (681)

Just as academic performance did not explain away the impact of high school cheating on college cheating, so we now see that college orientation does not explain it away. Table 7.10 shows that both of these variables are important, but that high school cheating has the stronger effect. Even the intellectually oriented college students who had cheated in high school engage in more academic dishonesty in college than the socially oriented who resisted the temptation to cheat in high school. And yet the data show that college orientation does result in the reformation of high school cheaters and acts as a constraint on the development of new cheaters. Almost half of the intellecually oriented college students who had cheated in high school no longer do so, and almost as many of the socially oriented who did not cheat in high school have taken up the practice in college. Do these changes reflect changes in orientation between high school and college? Table 7.11, which introduces high school orientation as well, deals with this question. To simplify the presentation, we have reduced high school orientations to three types by grouping those who are high on both the academic and social dimensions with those who are low on both. Even though these groups differ markedly in their likelihood of being members of the leading high school crowd (Table 7.2) they show very similar distributions on college orientation (Table 7.3) and high school cheating (Table 7.4). Therefore, for our present purpose, they can be treated as a single group.

TABLE 7.11

Per Cent Cheating in College by College
Orientation, High School Orientation,
and High School Cheating

		High School Cheating	
High School Orientation Was Academic		Yes	No
College orientation is	Intellectual	46 (290)	19 (402)
	Both/Neither	54 (215)	32 (296)
	Social	64 (185)	33 (191)
High School Orientation Was Both or Neither			
College orientation is	Intellectual	57 (420)	27 (427)
	Both/Neither	63 (453)	37 (437)
	Social	70 (534)	41 (364)
High School Orientation Was Social			
College orientation is	Intellectual	66 (152)	37 (95)
	Both/Neither	72 (210)	37 (103)
	Social	81 (316)	48 (117)

Again we see the pronounced effect of high school cheating on college cheating when we control for other variables, the variables this time being the student's orientations in high school and in college. But

Table 7.11 also shows that value-orientation in high school, quite apart from high school cheating, has an effect on college cheating. In fact, by comparing Tables 7.9 and 7.11, we see that the effect of orientation, both in high school and in college, is greater than that of grades at these two stages in the educational sequence. Holding constant high school cheating and orientation, we see that the more intellectually oriented college students cheat less than the more socially oriented ones. Similarly, high school orientation makes a consistent difference in college cheating among the high school cheaters and noncheaters alike.

The students least prone to cheat in college are those without a prior cheating history who have been consistently academically or intellectually oriented; those most prone to cheat are those who cheated in high school and have been consistently socially oriented. The difference between these extreme groups comes to some 62 percentage points.

Of particular interest are the students who have changed their orientations. Those who have moved away from their academic orientation in high school toward a social orientation in college are more apt to continue cheating if they did so in high school or to take up cheating, if they did not than their peers who have maintained their intellectual orientation. Conversely, the socially oriented in high school who have been converted to an intellectual orientation in college are less likely to cheat in college than those who have continued to be socially oriented. These findings imply the influence of college peer groups, which may well redirect high school orientations.

That the orientation students had in high school continues to have an effect even when college orientation is controlled seems even

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Chapter 8

PEER DISAPPROVAL AND CHEATING

The transition from high school to college is apt to have a profound impact on many students. It means leaving the adolescent society, with its emphasis on social activities, and moving into a new society on the college campus, one which confronts them with different, and perhaps unfamiliar, values and modes of behavior.

We already know that students are not as likely to cheat in college as they were in high school even though the competition is keener in college. This suggests that the campus culture endorses stronger norms of honesty and integrity in academic work than does the high school culture. Consistent with this assumption was the finding, reported in Chapter 5, that most college students disapprove strongly of academic dishonesty. Students' disapproval of cheating should not only act as a deterrent to their own cheating behavior, but it should also discourage their peers from engaging in academic dishonesty. This indirect effect of disapproval, its role in constraining the behavior of others, is the theme that we explore in this chapter. We shall look at the extent to which the students' college peer group serves as a deterrent to cheating behavior.

But if disapproval is to act as a social force constraining the behavior of others, those who disapprove must make their disapproval known. In short, peers can only act as a source of control if they communicate their disapproval to would-be offenders and take action against those who violate the norms of the group. On a given campus, the level of social disapproval will depend on the number of students who manage in one way or another to communicate their disapproval of cheating. And so our first task is to see whether students are willing to express their disapproval of academic dishonesty and, if so, what forms their disapproval takes.

Students' Reactions to Those Who Cheat

To get at students' reactions to the cheating of others, we presented them with two hypothetical situations in which they encounter another student cheating. In each instance, they could choose among five possible paths of action. One question asked them what they would do if they saw another student cheating during a test or exam, and the other asked them what they would do if another student approached them for help during a test or exam. These questions required answers for different kinds of students--a "close friend," a "campus leader," and "just another student." This design permits us to see whether the actions students would take are influenced by who the cheating student is. Table 8.1 shows how students would behave if they discovered someone cheating on a test or exam.

From the first column of Table 8.1 we learn that more than a third of the students would ignore the incident if they saw another student cheating, but almost two-thirds would take some action. Only a tiny fraction (4 per cent) would report him immediately to the authorities; a larger proportion (15 per cent) would ask the student to report himself and would report him if he failed to do so. Combining these two responses, we find that about one in five students would make certain that the cheating incident was brought to the proper authorities.

TABLE 8.1

Students' Reactions at Seeing Various Individuals Cheating on a Test or Exam

	Another student	A campus leader	A close friend
% who would report him to the instructor, proctor, or appropriate authority	4%	5%	2%
% who would ask him to report himself and report him if he fails to do so	15	17	14
% who would express disapproval informally but not report him	28	27	53
% who would mention the incident to other students but not report him	18	25	4
% who would ignore the incident	35	26	27
	100% (5,372)	100% (5,280)	100% (5,306)

Almost half the students would express their disapproval informally, mainly by telling the offender that they disapproved of his behavior (28 per cent) or by telling other students about the incident (18 per cent).

If the culprit is a campus leader (column two), fewer students would ignore the incident and slightly more would see to it that the incident was reported to authorities. Those who would not report the incident to officials are apt to tell their fellow students about it rather than merely ignore it. Campus leaders, then, would receive more severe sanctions than the average student, presumably because, as leaders, they are more obliged to adhere to the norms of the college culture.

The pattern of reactions to a cheater who happens to be a close friend is rather different. Students are less prone to report a friend to the appropriate authorities or insist that he report himself, but they are much more likely to express their disapproval informally to their cheating friend; in fact, a majority of the students would choose this approach.

The pattern of response to situations in which students are asked for illicit help by others (as distinct from observing others cheat) is shown in Table 8.2.

TABLE 8.2

Students' Reactions at Being Asked for Help on a Test or Exam by Various Individuals

	Another student	A campus leader	A close friend
% who would give him the answer	4%	3%	8%
% who would say nothing but expose your paper so that he can copy the answer	8	7	17
% who would ignore or turn down his request	71	68	51
% who would express disapproval informally but not report him	14	17	22
% who would report him to the appropriate authorities	3	5	2
	100% (5,380)	100% (5,338)	100% (5,347)

The table shows that only 12 per cent would cooperate if the person requesting help were just another student, and even fewer, 10 per cent, would cooperate if the request came from a campus leader. Most students would simply ignore the request, substantially more than would ignore a cheating incident that they happened to observe. Some 17 per cent would take some direct action against the would-be cheater if he were just another student and 22 per cent would, if he were a campus leader, generally by expressing their disapproval informally rather than by reporting him to the authorities. Of course, not cooperating with the student by ignoring his request is itself a way of manifesting disapproval.

The pattern is somewhat different when the person asking for help is a close friend. Fewer students (about half) would simply ignore or turn down his request; more would express disapproval to him and, at the same time, more would comply with the request. A quarter of the students would help a friend who was in trouble on a test or exam if he asked for it, and almost as many would apply stronger sanctions than merely ignoring the request. In all, three-quarters of the students would turn down the illegitimate request even if it were to come from a close friend.

These hypothetical situations indicate that most students are apt to make known their disapproval when a cheating incident arises. If they saw someone cheating on an exam, only a third would ignore the incident, and if they were asked for help on a test or exam, even fewer would give help. In both cases a majority would take actions that express disapproval or that tend to frustrate another student's efforts to cheat. Students' disapproval of cheating, then, which, as we saw in Chapter 5, is quite strong and widespread, is not likely to be concealed. On the contrary, these data suggest that students are ready to convert their personal disapproval into social action when confronted with a cheating incident. And so it would appear that students' peers act as a source of social control. Where peers strongly disapprove of cheating, we should find that fewer students cheat. We shall soon see the extent to which this is true.

Students' Perceptions of Disapproval

If the personal disapproval is to have a social impact, it must not only be *expressed* in social situations, but it must also *be perceived* by the would-be cheater. Presumably, the greater the number of students who take action against those who cheat and the more punitive the actions they take, the more likely are students to perceive disapproval among their peers. But students on the same campus can be expected to differ in the amount of disapproval they perceive, since exposure to and sensitivity to the disapproval of others will vary. Fortunately, we have direct information on the perception of others' disapproval. Each student was asked to indicate how strongly various individuals would disapprove if they knew he had cheated. Specifically, we asked them about disapproval from a "close friend on campus," "one of the students you go around with," "a faculty member," and "your parents."

Although we are primarily interested in the first two parts of the question, those dealing with peers, it is of some interest to see how perceived disapproval of peers compares with the disapproval expected from elders, namely faculty members and parents. These data are shown in Table 8.3.

TABLE 8.3

Student's Perceptions of Disapproval of Cheating
Among Various Individuals

	They Would Disapprove:				
	Very Strongly	Fairly Strongly	Not very Strongly	Not at All	
A close friend	38%	31	23	8	100% (5,316)
One of the students you go around with	28%	36	28	8	100% (5,310)
A faculty member	89%	10	1	--	100% (5,315)
Your parents	82%	15	2	1	100% (5,300)

Two things are immediately evident from the table: students perceive disapproval from all quarters, and they believe that their elders would disapprove more strongly than their peers. Thus a majority of students think that a close friend and that one of the students they go around with would disapprove either "very strongly" or "fairly strongly" of their having cheated. About a quarter of the students say that each of these peers would disapprove "not very strongly," and fewer than one out of ten think that they would not disapprove at all.

These findings are consistent with what students tell us about their own sense of disapproval of cheating and about what they would do if they encountered someone cheating. In effect, most students disapprove of cheating, would express their disapproval in one fashion or another, and perceive that other students disapprove just as they do. (That at least half the students nonetheless cheat is a testimonial to the powerful forces making for this kind of deviant behavior).

When it comes to their elders, parents and faculty members, more than four out of every five students feel that they would be met with very strong disapproval from these quarters if they were caught cheating, and virtually all the rest feel that their elders would disapprove fairly strongly. The almost unanimous agreement among students that their elders, both faculty and parents, would strongly disapprove of cheating suggests that elders play an important part in stimulating acceptance of norms of academic integrity among students and in reinforcing their commitment to these norms. Were it not for this strong and uniform stand of parents and faculty members, the level of disapproval among students might well be weaker. But since there is little variation in the amount of disapproval students perceive from their parents and from faculty, disapproval from these sources cannot account for much of the variation in academic dishonesty among individual students.

The situation is different when it comes to perceived disapproval from peers. Students are split into three nearly equal groups, those saying "very strongly, "fairly strongly," and "not very strongly" or "not at all," when it comes to the disapproval they expect from the two kinds of peers. In short, although most students think their peers would disapprove of their cheating, there is considerable variation in the level of disapproval they perceive.

Peer Group Disapproval and Academic Dishonesty

How does strength of peer group disapproval of cheating, or at least the perception of such disapproval, affect students' cheating behavior? Our assumption is that students who believe that their peers, especially their close friends, would disapprove strongly of their cheating are not likely to cheat; conversely, students who think their peer groups are tolerant of cheating might well succumb when tempted.

To test this notion, we have combined students' responses to the questions dealing with both groups of peers--close friends and students they go around with--to form a measure of peer group disapproval. In constructing the index, we trichotomized students' responses to each of the two items and combined them to form a five-point scale. At one extreme are the students who say that both close friends and students they go around with would disapprove "very strongly"; at the other, those who say that both parties would disapprove "not very strongly" or "not at all"; and in between, those showing intermediate levels of peer group disapproval.

As can be seen from Table 8.4, the disapproval of cheating that students sense among their peers has a strong relation to their cheating behavior. The stronger the disapproval they perceive, the less likely are they to cheat.

TABLE 8.4

Per Cent Cheating by Perceived Peer Group Disapproval

Index of Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	% Cheating
Very strong	26 (1,352)
Fairly strong	41 (657)
Moderate	49 (1,318)
Fairly weak	59 (443)
Very weak	71 (1,532)

When peer group disapproval is strong, only about a quarter of the students cheat; when it is weak, almost three-quarters do. This relationship is as strong as any we have uncovered so far in the search for determinants of academic dishonesty.

The question remains, however, whether perception of peer group disapproval affects cheating, independently of the other variables we have considered. It is well known that a person's friends are apt to share with him the same values, attitudes, and social characteristics.[1] Thus, college students are likely to choose as friends those who make the same kind of adaptation to the student role as they do, share their orientation to college, and hold a similar moral position with respect to cheating. It is probable, then, that the students whose peers disapprove of cheating are those who already have the attributes that restrain them from cheating. This is all the more likely since we are dealing with the perception of disapproval rather than an independent measure of the peer group's position. Students who feel strong personal disapproval of cheating may attribute this attitude to their peers even when their peers do not feel this way. In short, students who perceive disapproval of cheating among their peers are also likely to lack the attributes that comprise the cheating syndrome. This expectation is borne out by the data in Table 8.5, which shows the relationship of perceived peer disapproval to the student's own attitude on cheating, his academic standing, and his orientation to college.

---

[1] Recent documentation of this as it applies to college students can be found in T. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process.

TABLE 8.5

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval Related to Personal Disapproval of Cheating, Grades, and Orientation to College

	% perceiving strong disapproval among peer group
Personal disapproval is	
Strong	55 (1,999)
Moderate	33 (2,126)
Weak	14 (1,028)
Grade average in college	
B or higher	45 (1,586)
B- or C+	37 (2,177)
C or lower	33 (1,472)
Orientation to college	
Primarily intellectual	45 (1,783)
Both-neither	38 (1,730)
Primarily social	29 (1,710)

Each of the three attributes that we have previously examined in connection with cheating is related to the perception of disapproval among the peer group. As we would expect, the relationship is particularly strong in the case of the student's own moral stand on cheating. Apparently, this attitude is one of the bases of similarity among friends.

We now know that students who have the "cheating syndrome"--poor grades, a social orientation toward college, and tolerance of cheating--are not likely to belong to peer groups that disapprove strongly of cheating (or, at least, they report that this is the case). Therefore, the question raised earlier is all the more pertinent: do peer group norms influence cheating independently of the student's own predispositions to engage in academic dishonesty? To answer this question we must examine the simultaneous effects of perceived peer disapproval and each of the three attributes that we already know are related to cheating. Table 8.6 shows the joint effect of peer disapproval and personal disapproval on the students' cheating behavior.

TABLE 8.6

Per Cent Cheating by Personal Disapproval and Perceived Peer Group Disapproval

	Perceived Peer Group Disapproval			
Personal disapproval of cheating	Strong	Moderate	Weak	% difference
Strong	26 (1,100)	41 (476)	50 (423)	-24
Moderate	37 (709)	50 (576)	67 (841)	-30
Weak	49 (142)	69 (230)	83 (656)	-34
% difference	-23	-26	-33	

The effect of peer group disapproval is by no means explained away by students' own feelings of disapproval. As can be seen by comparing the patterns in the columns and rows, peer group disapproval has at least as strong an influence as does personal disapproval.[2]

Both kinds of disapproval have a marked effect, and, interestingly enough, the effect of one kind is stronger when the other kind is weak, as can be seen by the pattern of the percentage differences in the columns and rows. It would appear that the weaker the disapproval from one source, the greater utility has disapproval from the other source in deterring academic dishonesty. Together, the two sources of disapproval show a powerful effect on cheating. There is a difference of almost 60 points in per cent cheating between the group in which both are strong and the one in which both are weak.

Table 8.7 shows the joint effect of peer disapproval and grades. No matter what the students' grade averages, the level of peer group disapproval strongly affects their likelihood of engaging in academic dishonesty. We might have expected that the disapproval of their peers would have less effect on those who are under pressure to pass courses and to stay in school than on the students who are doing well in their academic work. But Table 8.7 shows that this is not the case. The poor students are almost as sensitive to the disapproval of their peers as are the good students.

---

[2] The relationship between peer disapproval and cheating is actually somewhat stronger than that between personal disapproval and cheating if we take into account the number of cases falling in the differenc classes. In the index of peer disapproval, as we have collapsed it, 75 per cent of the cases fall into the extreme groups, compared with 59 per cent falling into the extreme groups on personal disapproval. If we collapse either variable differently so that its marginal distribution more nearly approximates that of the other, peer disapproval shows a stronger relationship to cheating than does personal disapproval.

TABLE 8.7

Per Cent Cheating by Grade Average and Perceived Peer Group Disapproval

	Perceived Peer Group Disapproval						
Grade average	Strong		Moderate		Weak		% difference
B or higher	25	(711)	45	(400)	63	(475)	-38
B- or C+	35	(794)	51	(560)	69	(823)	-34
C or lower	36	(476)	52	(364)	71	(652)	-35
% difference	-11		-7		-8		

When peer group disapproval is held constant, grades prove to have only a minor effect on cheating. Moreover, what difference there is comes between those with "B or higher" grades and those lower in academic standing. There is virtually no difference between those with "B- or C+" grades and those whose grades are "C or lower" within each disapproval group. In short, the power of the peer group is such as to almost nullify the pressures to cheat that arise from students' poor academic performances. When the peer group condones cheating, even the good students, those who presumably have little reason to cheat, nevertheless do so almost as often as the poor students in the same kind of peer group. In fact, the proportion of cheaters among the good students who perceive only weak disapproval from their peers (the upper right corner of Table 8.7) is almost twice as great as the proportion among the poor students who feel that their peers disapprove strongly of cheating (the lower left corner of the table).

Remaining to be seen is the joint effects of peer group disapproval and orientation in college. This is shown in Table 8.8.

TABLE 8.8

Per Cent Cheating by Orientation to College and
Perceived Peer Group Disapproval

	Perceived Peer Group Disapproval			
Orientation to college	Strong	Moderate	Weak	% difference
Primarily intellectual	26 (802)	41 (444)	59 (537)	-33
Both/neither	30 (672)	50 (429)	69 (629)	-39
Primarily social	40 (503)	57 (431)	74 (776)	-34
% difference	-14	-16	-15	

By comparing the columns and rows of Table 8.8, we see that the level of disapproval students perceive among their peers has a much stronger effect on their cheating behavior than their orientation to college. Intellectually and socially oriented alike cheat less the more they think their peers would disapprove. Although the socially oriented are more inclined to cheat than the intellectually oriented whatever the level of peer group disapproval, they are nonetheless just as responsive to changes in peer disapproval as the intellectually oriented. Thus cheating increases to about the same extent in each orientation group as peer disapproval weakens.

Taken together, these tables (Tables 8.6, 8.7, and 8.8) show that the disapproval students perceive among their peers is a powerful determinant of their cheating behavior apart from their own predispositions toward academic dishonesty. It is as important as their own moral attitude toward cheating, and quite a bit more important than their adaptation to academic demands and their orientation to college.

Understanding the nature of the social environment in which the student finds himself in college is thus essential to explaining his cheating behavior.

The measure of peer group disapproval that we have been using is confined to the closely circumscribed group the student considers to be good friends and with whom he spends much of his free time. Beyond this immediate interpersonal environment is the student body at large. No doubt, the disapproval that is felt and expressed by the student's close associates comes from and is reinforced by students outside his particular peer group. In other words, we can expect that student bodies vary from campus to campus in their level of disapproval of cheating and that the findings on the student's immediate peer group reflect in large part differences in campuswide norms reflecting cheating. To test this possibility, we must have a measure of disapproval for the broader social context--a measure of the "climate" of peer disapproval of the college.

Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

How can we gauge the climate of peer disapproval at a college? For our measure of disapproval in the individual student's peer group, we relied on his perceptions (since we did not have independent data from the members of his peer group). When it comes to the climate of peer disapproval of the college, we shall rely on students' perceptions once again, but in this case, we shall take account of data from all the students who represent their college in our sample. Our measure derives from the perceptions of peer group disapproval of all students in our sample from a college. Specifically, each college is classified according to its median value on the index of peer group disapproval. Thus, a school may fall into one of five possible climates of peer disapproval corresponding to the five categories on the index of peer group disapproval for the individual student, depending on how strongly the average student at that college thinks the members of his particular peer group would disapprove of cheating. Once we have determined the climate of peer disapproval of a college, all students in our sample from that school are classified in terms of the climate.

For each of the five climates or levels of student-body disapproval, Table 8.9 shows the number of colleges with that climate, the number of students attending colleges with that climate, and the per cent of students who have cheated at schools with that climate. For example there are eight schools with a very strong climate of peer disapproval, represented by 532 students, 23 per cent of whom have cheated since coming to college. At the other extreme, there are 18 schools with very weak climates of peer disapproval; 901 students come from these schools, and 69 per cent of them have cheated.

TABLE 8.9

Per Cent Cheating by Climate of Peer
Disapproval at Their College

~~School-Climate~~ of Peer Disapproval School Climate of Peer Disapproval	% Cheating	Number of Students	Number of Colleges
Very Strong	23%	532	8
Fairly Strong	36	1,072	18
Moderate	50	2,165	40
Fairly Weak	59	752	15
Very Weak	69	901	18

From Table 8.9 we see that the climate of disapproval does vary from campus to campus and that it has an important effect on students' cheating behavior. Where the climate of disapproval is very strong, less than a quarter of the students cheat; this proportion steadily increases until, at schools where norms against cheating are very weak, more than two-thirds of the students engage in cheating. In other words, the disapproval perceived by all students at a college (our measure of the climate of disapproval) has a strong effect on the chances that any one of them will cheat.

Of course, we do not yet know whether the climate of disapproval on campus has an effect on cheating, independent of the disapproval students perceive among the members of their own peer group. Since the school climate of disapproval is based on the aggregate of perceived peer group disapproval, there is the possibility that the findings in Table 8.9 are an artifact of the relationship already shown in Table 8.5. Thus, school climate of disapproval may simply reflect the effects of peer group disapproval or it may have the status of an additional independent source of disapproval affecting the student's cheating behavior.

In Table 8.10 we separate the effects of these two variables by showing how they jointly relate to cheating. The table shows that both kinds of social disapproval serve to deter academic dishonesty--the disapproval students perceive in their immediate interpersonal environment on campus, and the climate of disapproval characteristic of the student body as a whole. No matter what the schoolwide climate of disapproval, students cheat less when they perceive disapproval from their close associates; conversely, no matter how s

TABLE 8.10

Per Cent Cheating by Perceived Peer Group Disapproval and Climate of Disapproval of the College

Perceived peer group disapproval	Strong	Moderate	Weak	% difference
Strong	25 (973)	35 (744)	43 (292)	-18
Moderate	39 (371)	52 (622)	56 (325)	-17
Weak	50 (228)	63 (761)	76 (986)	-26
% difference	-25	-28	-33	

how strongly those in their immediate circles disapprove, their propensity to cheat is influenced by those with whom they have more casual social relationships, that is, the student body as a whole. A student's close associates seem to have a somewhat stronger impact on his behavior than do those more distant from him (this can be seen by comparing the percentage differences in the columns with those in the rows), but both sources disapproval show a substantial independent effect.

Again, in this table, as in Table 8.6, we see that disapproval from one source seems to have greater utility in deterring academic dishonesty when disapproval from the other source is weaker. Thus, the differences in per cent cheating due to one source of disapproval become greater as we move from strong to weak disapproval from the other source. In effect, we have two independent levels of external normative constraints upon cheating. Both are sources of disapproval among peers; they differ only in the scope of the social environment on which they focus. And it is clear from these data that the social climates on campus--the norms of the peer group and of the student body as a whole--play a central role in determining the amount of cheating that goes on among college students.

The Campus Climate of Disapproval and the Cheating History of Students

We saw in Chapter 4 that the students who are going to cheat in college appear to do so not long after they begin their college careers. The cumulative level of academic dishonesty rises only slightly after the freshman year. One explanation for this might be that students have developed a disposition toward academic dishonesty--a cheating syndrome, as we have called it--that is fairly well set by the time they reach college. Some support for this view was provided in the previous chapter, where we saw that some of the same factors that lead to cheating in college had also existed when the students were in high school and led them to cheat at that earlier time. Moreover, those students who learned to cheat in high school were much more inclined to do so in college.

Nevertheless, we also saw that a consistent disposition toward cheating, developed in high school and carried through to college, does not fully explain college cheating behavior. We found that some students took up cheating for the first time only after they reached college and that a number of high school cheaters stopped cheating when they reached the college campus. Changes in academic performance and value-orientations between high school and college accounted for only part of these changes in cheating behavior. At the time we suggested that the climate of opinion at the college the student attends might well account for these changes in his behavior. We are now ready to examine this possibility.

The hypothesis before us is that students who have taken up cheating for the first time in college are those attending schools where the climate of peer disapproval of cheating is weak and, conversely, that high school cheaters who have stopped cheating in college are those attending schools where the climate of disapproval is strong. The relevant data are presented in Table 8.11.

TABLE 8.11

Per Cent Cheating in College by High School Cheating and Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

	High School Cheating			
Climate of peer disapproval of the college	Yes		No	
Strong	45	(717)	21	(875)
Moderate	64	(1,169)	34	(979)
Weak	78	(959)	46	(670)

Table 8.11 provides rather dramatic confirmation of the importance of the college climate of disapproval on the cheating history of college students. Among both those who did and those who did not cheat in high school, college cheating increases as the climate of disapproval weakens. Less than half the high school cheaters who are attending colleges with strong climates of disapproval are still cheating, compared with more than three-fourths of the high school cheaters at schools with weak climates of disapproval. In other words, more than half the high school cheaters attending schools with strong disapproval climates have given up cheating compared with less than a quarter of their counterparts in schools with weak climates of disapproval. Among students who did not cheat in high school, only about one in every five have taken up cheating in college if they attend a school with a strong climate of disapproval, whereas almost half of those in schools with weak climates of disapproval have taken up cheating for the first time.

One further aspect of Table 8.11 may be noted. From the base figures it can be seen that students who did not cheat in high school are somewhat more likely to attend schools where the climate of disapproval is strong. Apparently, the noncheaters are attracted to and recruited by these kinds of schools.

By comparing Table 8.11 with Tables 7.9 and 7.11, we see that the climate of disapproval on campus is a much more important determinant of change in cheating behavior than are changes in students' academic performance or changes in their value-orientations.

The climate of disapproval at the college, then, plays an important role in determining both the level of cheating at the college and the changes in students' cheating behavior that occur between high school and college. Students seem to be sensitive to the feelings and attitudes of their peers. As we suggested at the beginning of this chapter, their acceptance and success in college depends on how well they live up to the standards of conduct established and enforced by their peers. But these standards do not develop in a vacuum. Some schools must provide better settings for norms of academic integrity to emerge and be maintained than do other schools. In the next two chapters we shall examine the characteristics of colleges associated with their climates of disapproval and the level of academic dishonesty among their student bodies.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Chapter 9

COLLEGE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE LEVEL OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

At previous points in the report, we have encountered evidence indicating that the student's likelihood of cheating is affected by the kind of college he attends. For example, the fact that cheating varies with the way courses are organized suggests that the college plays a role. Large classes and standardized testing procedures, factors associated with cheating, would seem to be more typical of certain kinds of colleges than of others. In the previous chapter, the importance of the college becomes explicit. We saw that the disapproval of cheating among the student body as a whole strongly affects the chances that the students at the school will cheat. In this chapter and the next, we shall concentrate on characteristics of colleges that contribute to the prevalence of academic dishonesty. We shall try to find out why some colleges have more cheating than others.

Although we are following up the theme of the previous chapter, the analysis in this one (and the next) involves some important changes of focus. For one thing, we are shifting from the individual student to the college itself as the unit of analysis. We shall no longer be examining why some students cheat and others do not, but rather why some colleges have a high level of cheating and other do not. For another, the analysis will make use of data collected from deans and student body presidents as well as those collected from students. By including data from deans and student body presidents we enlarge our sample of schools and can, therefore, examine relationships between college characteristics in more detail.

It will be remembered that the students in our sample were selected from 99 schools, but that reports of deans are available on more than 600 schools and of student body presidents, on more than 500. We shall use the students' reports about their own cheating behavior to characterize the 99 schools that they represent. To get a measure of the level of cheating at schools represented by deans and student body presidents, we must rely on their perceptions of the amount of academic dishonesty. Such a measure has been constructed from two questions about the level of cheating on their campuses: one asking them to estimate what proportion of the students on their campuses have cheated or plagiarized (which we already made use of in Chapter 2), the other asking them how the amount of cheating and plagiarism at their colleges compares with the level at other colleges across the country. Their responses to each of these questions were trichotomized and then combined to form a five-point index of academic dishonesty for the college.[1]

Before showing the kinds of schools characterized by high rates of cheating, we should document the fact that schools do vary considerably in the extent of their cheating "problem." This is done in Table 9.1 for the 99 schools from which students were sampled.

The table makes it clear that the 99 schools range widely in the percentage of students who admit having cheated. At one extreme are 13

---

[1] Appendix B shows in detail how the indices of academic dishonesty based on the reports of deans and student body presidents were constructed. It also shows the association between the index scores for deans and for student body presidents from the same school and how each measure is related to the level of cheating according to the self reports of students at the 99 schools.

TABLE 9.1

Distribution of Schools by Level of Cheating Among Students

Proportion of students at the school who cheat	Number of schools	%
4% - 29%	13	13%
30% - 39%	14	14
40% - 49%	20	20
50% - 59%	17	17
60% - 69%	24	25
70% - 89%	11	11
	99	100%

schools where fewer than 30 per cent of the students cheat; at the other, 11 schools where 70 per cent or more report cheating. This fairly even distribution of schools according to level of cheating suggests that institutional factors are important in understanding the prevalence of academic dishonesty.

For purposes of analysis, we shall only distinguish between "high" and "low" cheating schools, defining as having a high level of cheating schools at which 50 per cent or more of the students cheat. As Table 9.1 indicates, 53 per cent of the 99 schools fall into the high cheating category.

For schools represented by deans and student body presidents, "high cheating" schools are those falling into the three highest categories of the index constructed from their perceptions. With this break, 65 per cent of the schools represented by deans and 62 per cent of those represented by student body presidents fall into the "high cheating" category. (These breaking points are closer to the one used for colleges represented by students than any others we could make.)

In the previous chapter, we saw that the college climate of disapproval had a very strong effect on the cheating behavior of the individual student. The importance of this "climate" variable is shown even more dramatically when we shift the focus from the student to the college. Table 9.2 presents the relationship between the climate of peer disapproval and the level of cheating of the college for the 99 schools represented by students.

At schools with a very strong climate of peer disapproval, the level of cheating is low in all cases, and at schools where the climate of peer disapproval is very weak, the level of cheating is almost always high. Moreover, the effect is not limited to the extreme categories, since the proportion of high cheating schools steadily increases as the climate of disapproval becomes weaker. Maintaining a certain level of peer disapproval on the campus seems tantamount to holding the cheating level to a certain point. In fact, the association in Table 9.2 is so strong that the climate of peer disapproval is virtually equivalent to the level of cheating. Thus, in the subsequent

TABLE 9.2

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating
By Climate of Peer Disapproval

Climate of peer disapproval	% with a high level of cheating
Very strong	0 (8)
Fairly strong	11 (18)
Moderate	55 (40)
Fairly weak	73 (15)
Very weak	94 (18)

analysis, when we explore factors associated with a high level of cheating at colleges, it should be kept in mind that the same factors are associated with climate of peer disapproval as well. The analytical problem before us, then, is to uncover characteristics of schools that foster a strong climate of peer disapproval and, in so doing, keep cheating at a low level.

The Role of School Quality

It is well known that institutions of higher learning in the United States vary markedly in the quality of education they provide. Whether the variations in the quality of the schools makes a difference in the amount of cheating that goes on in them is in many respects a crucial question. In the opening chapter of this report, we pointed out that academic dishonesty may have unfortunate consequences beyond the boundaries of the campus since the elite of American society tends to be recruited from the college population. From this perspective, one might well view with alarm the fact that at least 50 per cent of our college students have engaged in dishonest behavior while preparing for their roles of leadership in society. The fact that this 50 per cent is probably less than the proportion who cheat in high school is hardly comforting. If we find, however, that the products of our best schools, the people most likely to assume positions of top leadership and responsibility, are not as prone to cheat as students attending the average college, the situation may be somewhat less disturbing.

But, although some colleges are clearly recognized as superior to others by virtually everyone, developing objective indices of such a complex phenomenon as "school quality" is no easy task.[2] A variety of indicators might be used for this purpose. For example, the size of the school library, the proportion of Ph.D.s on the faculty, and tuition costs are among the indicators used to measure the quality of the school in one study.[3] One can quarrel with almost any indicators of this elusive property, pointing out exceptions to the rule. Nevertheless, we shall proceed to examine three attributes of colleges that, among other things, seem to point to differences in institutional quality.

The first indicator of school quality to be considered reflects the caliber of students recruited by a college--the proportion of students admitted among those who apply. We can safely assume that the better schools attract more and abler applicants and that they can be more selective than schools of lesser quality. In effect, the better schools can hold to more exacting standards of academic achievement in selecting entrants.

The relationship between the level of cheating at the college and its academic quality as measured by the per cent of students admitted among those who apply is shown in Table 9.3 for three samples of schools--those represented by deans, by student body presidents, and by students. (In this and subsequent tables presenting data from more than one source, there will be discrepancies among the various sets of schools in the per cent falling into the high cheating category simply because the proportion of high cheating schools varies somewhat in each sample.)

---

[2] Some investigators have preferred to rely on subjective ratings of "quality," which take account of a great variety of indicators in a relatively unsystematic way rather than systematically incorporating objective indicators to derive a measure. Notably, Bernard Berelson has taken this approach in his study, Graduate Education in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960). See, especially, his "Note on Quality Rating of Institutions," pp. 124 ff.

[3] See Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958).

TABLE 9.3

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Proportion Admitted Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating		
Proportion admitted	Deans	SBPs	Students
0 - 45%	45 (153)	48 (144)	33 (33)
46% - 75%	71 (189)	62 (117)	54 (37)
76% - 100%	76 (184)	73 (156)	68 (25)

The data from all three sources show that the proportion of schools with a high level of cheating increases as admissions policies become less selective.

There is at least a 25-point difference in the per cent of schools with a high level of cheating in all three samples. Furthermore, the data from all three sources indicate that the greatest difference in the per cent of schools with a high level of cheating comes between those that admit fewer than half their applicants and those that admit half or more; that is, between the top echelon of schools in terms of selectivity and all others. Thus we find, at least according to this measure of quality, that cheating is less prevalent among students attending better colleges, especially among those at the best schools. No doubt, attracting abler and more promising students who are more deeply committed to the intellectual life is an asset in supporting a climate of academic integrity.

The second aspect of school quality that we shall examine reflects not so much the caliber of the students as the quality of the instruction.

It is safe to assume that in schools in which the faculty-student ratio is high (where there are fewer students per faculty member), students will on the average receive better instruction than at schools where it is low. After all, the more even the balance between students and faculty on a campus, the more likely are students to receive personal attention and stimulation from the faculty. Table 9.4 shows that the faculty-student ratio is even more strongly related to the level of cheating of the college than is the proportion of students admitted.

TABLE 9.4

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Faculty-Student Ratio Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

Faculty-student ratio	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating Deans	SBPs	Students
1 / 10 or higher	37 (109)	33 (97)	31 (29)
1 / 11 to 1 / 13	54 (112)	54 (100)	38 (21)
1 / 14 to 1 / 16	74 (154)	70 (124)	58 (26)
1 / 17 or lower	80 (142)	83 (94)	74 (23)

There is a striking similarity in the relationship shown in each of the three samples. Only about a third of the schools characterized by a faculty-student ratio of 1 to 10 or higher have high cheating levels; the proportion of high cheating schools steadily increases as the faculty-student ratio decreases; among schools with the lowest ratio, at least three out of four have high levels of cheating.

Besides quality of instruction, the faculty-student ratio also points to an aspect of social relationships on the campus that might well affect the amount of cheating that goes on. At schools where the number of students per faculty member is relatively small, there is apt to be closer social contact, both formal and informal, between students and faculty. At such schools, faculty members will get to know students better and, consequently, students will be more strongly influenced by the norms of academic integrity that faculty members hold. In short, students' personal disapproval of cheating should be reinforced and stimulated by closer contact with faculty. Thus a college with a high faculty-student ratio should provide a good setting for a climate of peer disapproval to emerge and be sustained.

Another characteristic of colleges that is strongly related to the cheating rate might also be thought of as an indicator of quality, and that is the proportion of the student body living on campus. Schools with high proportion of commuters who live at home, generally the city colleges, are not apt to be as richly endowed and to have as ample facilities as the colleges that maintain residence halls. Also, the commuting students are more likely to hold jobs and attend school on a part-time basis than students who do not commute. And, to the extent that they have other obligations, the commuters are apt to be less committed to the student role than those who live on campus and attend school full-time. As can be seen from Table 9.5, the greater the percentage of students living on campus, the less likely is the school to have a high rate of cheaters.

Like the faculty-student ratio, the proportion of students living on campus tells us something about social relationships on the campus as well as about school quality. Where the proportion of students living on campus is high, social contact and cohesiveness among members of the student body is likely to be greater; fewer students will find

TABLE 9.5

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Proportion of Students Living on Campus Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

Proportion of Students Living on Campus	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating		
	Deans	SBPs	Students
0 - 49%	80 (170)	73 (125)	71 (24)
50% - 79%	68 (198)	68 (152)	50 (36)
80% - 100%	44 (165)	43 (159)	46 (39)

their friends and interests off-campus. Such a setting may be an ideal one for the emergence of a strong climate of peer disapproval of cheating.

Thus, the three indicators of quality show a strong relationship to the level of cheating of the college, and each suggests a somewhat different process at work contributing to the climate of peer disapproval on the campus. In the remainder of the chapter we shall examine two commonly used distinctions among schools--sex composition and school size as they relate to the level of cheating.

Sex Composition and Size of Enrollment

We saw in Chapter 6 that students who are oriented to the social aspects of college life are more likely to cheat than those oriented to the intellectual aspects. Coed colleges in contrast with men's colleges and women's colleges would appear to encourage the social orientations of students. These schools provide more opportunities for dating, and it is at these colleges that fraternities and sororoties are more often found. We might expect, then, that coed colleges have higher rates of cheating than single sex colleges. Table 9.6 shows this to be so.

TABLE 9.6

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Sex Composition Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating					
Sex composition	Deans		SBPs		Students	
All female	25	(79)	18	(92)	19	(16)
All male	50	(64)	55	(57)	50	(16)
Coeducational	75	(444)	74	(341)	61	(67)

Whether we rely on the reports of deans or student body presidents, or the students' reports of their own cheating behavior, the pattern is much the same. The cheating rate is higher at the coed schools than at the single sex schools; but, in addition, we see that, within the single sex schools, the men's colleges have higher cheating levels than the women's colleges. The latter finding suggests that girls generally cheat less than the boys and Table A.1 in Appensix A shows that this is true. This difference in cheating between the sexes does not explain the difference between the coed schools and the single sex schools, however, since the men's colleges have lower rates of cheating than do the coed schools. Thus, the difference between the coed and single sex schools is perhaps best explained by the different social climates at these schools, the greater emphasis on social life at the coed schools and greater emphasis on intellectual matters at the single sex schools. This implies that the single sex colleges are generally of higher academic quality than the coed schools. Table 9.7 explores this matter by showing the relationship between sex composition and the various indicators of quality in the schools represented by deans and student body presidents.[4]

The table shows that the single sex schools are more likely to be highly selective than the coed institutions, to have higher faculty-student ratios, and to have larger proportions of their students living on campus. Thus, in each respect, the single sex schools come out better on our indicators of quality than do the coed schools.

But the pattern suggests that factors other than quality of school are at work. We saw that women's colleges tend to have the lowest rates of cheating, and yet men's colleges come out better than women's colleges on two of the three indicators of quality, proportion of applicants accepted and proportion of students living on campus. Only in respect to the faculty-student ratio is the position of women's colleges in keeping with their low level of cheating.

Schools with high faculty-student ratios are apt to be small schools, and women's colleges generally tend to be small in size. This would suggest that size of school is another characteristic related to the cheating rate. We know that cheating is more prevalent in large classes, and large classes in turn are more apt to be found at the large schools. Table 9.8 shows that the proportion of schools with high cheating levels steadily increases with size of school in two of our three samples of

---

[4] We have omitted schools represented by samples of students from this table and from some of the succeeding tables in this chapter and the next. Since this sample is relatively small it yields somewhat unstable percentages especially in tables with more complex breakdowns. The patterns in this sample are quite similar to the ones shown for the samples represented by deans and student body presidents. It will be our practice to include the schools represented by students only in those tables showing the distribution of a single institutional characteristic among schools and in those showing the relationship between a single institutional characteristic and the level of cheating of the college.

TABLE 9.7

Sex Composition of the College Related to Three Indicators of Quality Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs

	Deans	SBPs
% of schools admitting 45% or fewer of students who apply		
Female	38 (61)	49 (65)
Male	58 (60)	85 (54)
Coed	21 (404)	24 (289)
% of schools with 13 or fewer students per faculty member		
Female	79 (71)	81 (83)
Male	66 (61)	69 (52)
Coed	44 (385)	55 (272)
% of schools having 80% or more of their students living on campus		
Female	46 (74)	56 (88)
Male	56 (61)	57 (53)
Coed	24 (396)	27 (295)

colleges. In the student sample, we find a slight reversal for the largest schools.

Although the patterns in Table 9.8 are in keeping with what we know about cheating in large classes, they are not completely consistent with the popular image of high quality colleges, since some of the best institutions of higher learning in America are quite large in size.

When we relate size of school to the three characteristics that suggest differences in quality, we find that one, the faculty-student ratio, is inversely related to size, and the other two, proportion of applicants admitted and proportion of students living on campus, show

TABLE 9.8

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Size of Enrollment Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating		
Size of Enrollment	Deans	SBPs	Students
0-499	41 (82)	33 (81)	26 (19)
500-999	53 (156)	52 (149)	28 (25)
1,000-2,999	67 (208)	72 (169)	76 (29)
3,000 or more	88 (130)	86 (90)	65 (26)

curvilinear relationships, with the schools of middle size coming out higher in quality than either the very small or the very large schools. These patterns can be seen from Table 9.9.

Since size of school is not consistantly related to these indicators of the quality of the institution, quality per se cannot explain why the level of cheating directly increases with size of school (with a minor exception in the students' sample). The smaller number of students per faculty member implies, as we have already suggested, that there is greater solidarity between students and faculty at these schools, a factor that would seem to reduce the level of academic dishonesty. Moreover, at small schools, students tend to know most of their peers, whereas at large schools, they get to know only a fraction of the student body. Therefore, the student at the large school is apt to feel relatively anonymous vis-a-vis the student body as a whole. The larger schools may provide a setting that facilitates the formation of deviant subgroups in which cheating is approved or at least tolerated. The chief relevance of a large enrollment may well be that it tends to

TABLE 9.9

Size of Enrollment of the College Related to Three Other College Characteristics Among Schools Represented by Deans and Student Body Presidents

	Deans	SBPs
% of schools admitting 45% or fewer of the students who apply		
499 or fewer students	16 (93)	21 (80)
500 to 999 students	36 (144)	41 (120)
1,000 to 2,999 students	35 (178)	44 (142)
3,000 or more students	22 (104)	23 (65)
% of schools with 13 or fewer students per faculty member		
499 or fewer students	68 (95)	74 (87)
500 to 999 students	49 (152)	52 (134)
1,000 to 2,999 students	34 (174)	36 (138)
3,000 or more students	21 (94)	24 (58)
% of schools having 80% or more of their students living on campus		
499 of fewer students	27 (95)	33 (90)
500 to 999 students	39 (155)	44 (135)
1,000 to 2,999 students	35 (180)	41 (144)
3,000 or more students	15 (102)	15 (66)

hamper the development of a uniform attitude of strong disapproval of cheating among the members of the student body.[5]

---

[5] The relevance of group size for the formation of subgroups with different attitudes and opinions has been explored by Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin A. Trow, and James S. Coleman in Union Democracy (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1956).

But, no doubt, other factors are at work as well. The large schools, for example, tend to be coeducational (the largest are state universities, which are obliged to accept all students of both sexes who meet minimum entrance requirements), and, thereby, schools that tend to foster a strong social orientation among students.

This probable association between sex composition and school size raises the question of whether these variables are independently related to the cheating level. Table 9.10 examines both these variables simultaneously as they relate to the level of cheating of the college. Since we are dealing with three variables in this table we shall group male and female schools into a single-sex category. Also, we shall consider only schools represented by deans and student body presidents since these samples contain enough schools to yield stable percentages.

When size is held constant, we see that coed schools have substantially higher rates of cheating than single sex schools on the basis of reports of both deans and student body presidents. When the sex composition of the student body is held constant, the rate of cheating continues to be higher in the larger schools. This is particularly apparent in the reports of the student body presidents. Among the schools represented by the reports of deans, size is relevant to the rate of cheating primarily in the coed institutions. In short, Table 9.10 indicates that both size and sex composition are relevant to the rate of cheating (facts that we shall take into account in subsequent analysis).

So far in the analysis of the correlates of the college cheating rate, we have examined characteristics of schools that are relatively fixed. In the next chapter, however, we shall consider a college characteristic that is more subject to alteration--the institutional arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty.

TABLE 9.10

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Sex Composition and Size Among Schools Represented by Deans and Student Body Presidents

	Deans		SBPs	
	Single Sex	Coed	Single Sex	Coed
Less than 1000	35 (96)	65 (169)	26 (101)	65 (142)
1000 or more	37 (43)	82 (269)	46 (44)	84 (189)

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Chapter 10

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTROLLING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

In the previous chapter, we saw that the level of academic dishonesty varies considerably among differing kinds of colleges and universities. In particular, the academic quality of the school, its size, and the sex composition of the student body show strong relationships to the amount of cheating at a school.

In this chapter, we shall examine the effects of various arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty on college campuses. Unlike sex composition and school size, which provide social settings more or less favorable to informal processes of social control, the institutional characteristics we shall be discussing in this chapter are formal social arrangements specifically designed to control academic dishonesty. This distinction between formal social arrangements designed to control cheating and institutional contexts that affect the rate of cheating largely through informal social processes permits us to weigh the relative effects of social factors over which there is relatively little control, and of institutional arrangements, which are amenable to change.

Formal Arrangements for Social Control

Perhaps the two most important aspects of "law enforcement" are catching the offender and punishing him. They may be termed, respectively, the "detection" and "sanction" aspects of a system of control. Formal arrangements for controlling deviant behavior require that responsibility be assigned for these tasks or aspects of control, and formal systems of control may be distinguished according to how this responsibility is allocated.

In most colleges and universities, the course instructor is responsible for detecting and sanctioning the academic dishonesty that occurs in his courses. In Chapter 2, we noted that faculty members usually decide on disciplinary measures in cases of cheating and plagiarism in the majority of the schools sampled. If a faculty member considers a cheating incident particularly serious, he may ask other members of the faculty for advice in handling the case, or he may pass the case on to someone in the administration, usually to a dean. He will handle most cases by himself, however.

The most common arrangement for control, then, would seem to be "faculty-centered" control. The faculty member is responsible for detecting instances of cheating and plagiarism by proctoring tests and examinations and by scrutinizing homework and term papers, perhaps checking questionable passages. If he determines that a student has cheated, the appropriate disciplinary measures to be taken are largely up to him. There are many colleges, however, at which students actively participate in arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty.

At more than 40 per cent of the colleges in our sample, students take part in the sanctioning aspect of control. These are schools at which students sit on committees or courts that determine guilt and assign penalties in cases of academic dishonesty. There are considerable variations among these boards or committees in terms of composition and mode of selection of student members. In some cases, the board is composed exclusively of students, and in others, there are only one or two students sitting as observers or in an advisory capacity. In some cases, the student members or representatives are elected from the student body; in others, they are appointed by student government leaders or even by the faculty or administration. There are also variations in the powers these bodies have: some can impose strict sanctions, including expulsion from school; some can review decisions made by other persons or groups; some hear cases of other kinds of misconduct in addition to academic dishonesty, and so on. Although there are differences among judiciary bodies on which students serve, they have in common the fact that they represent some measure of student participation in the sanctioning aspect of control.

The limited size of judicial bodies suggests that only a minority of the students at colleges using them can participate directly in formal arrangements for control, even though the student body as a whole may participate indirectly by electing student jurors and student proctors. At some schools, however, there is an institutional arrangement that extends direct responsibility for controlling academic dishonesty to each individual student: it is generally referred to as the "honor system."

Under the honor system, all students at a college typically pledge to abide by the highest standards of honesty and integrity in their academic work. The principles of academic integrity are usually stated in an "honor code" that stresses the fundamental importance of honesty to a tradition of scholarship and learning of which the college is proud. Moreover, the honor code generally places all students on their honor not to cheat or plagiarize or otherwise employ deceit in their academic work and requires them to report themselves and, in many cases, to report other students for any breach of this trust.

This arrangement has the effect of extending responsibility for the detection aspect of control to the individual students, especially in those schools in which they are responsible for reporting other students as well as themselves for academic dishonesty. In return for accepting this responsibility, students are usually freed from formal proctoring by faculty. At many schools with honor systems, subscription to the honor code is a condition of admission.

Honor-system schools not only place responsibility for enforcing standards of academic honesty in the hands of the students, they also give students the right to exercise judicial power. Courts or committees empowered to determine guilt and assign punishments in cases of academic dishonesty are composed mostly or wholly of students who are elected by the student body. These bodies are usually empowered to recommend or impose severe penalties, including permanent expulsion from school. In many schools, their judgments are subject to review only by the highest administrative authorities of the college and, in some schools, there is no appeal from their decision.

Penalties for cheating under the honor system are generally more severe than those at schools without honor systems. The act of cheating under the honor system breaches a trust the student has accepted to live up to an articulated code of conduct and therefore constitutes dishonorable as well as dishonest behavior. By defining cheating in this way as a kind of "compound offense," the honor system legitimates more severe sanctions.

In effect, under the honor system students take primary responsibility for both the detection and the sanction aspects of control. In return for their willingness to report themselves, and perhaps others, for cheating, students are given the authority to hear cases of cheating and to decide what should be done about them. Where the honor system is in force, the problem of academic dishonesty is met with what may be termed "student-centered" control.

In sum, there are three basic arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty. At one extreme are the honor-system schools we have just discussed, at which responsibility for control is in the hands of students; at the other extreme are the majority of schools at which the faculty takes responsibility for controlling academic dishonesty. Between these extremes are the schools at which responsibility for control is shared by students and faculty. These are schools at which students serve on judiciary bodies that hear cases involving academic dishonesty. Typically, students do not constitute a majority on such bodies; they usually serve along with faculty or administrators. The students who do serve on the committee or court, rather than being elected, are usually appointed by other student government officers and sometimes by faculty or administration. Students usually have a vote, although, in some cases, they sit only as observers. Under this sort of arrangement students share to a greater or lesser extent in the responsibility for the sanction aspect of control although they do not have responsibility for detecting or reporting instances of cheating.

How prevalent are the three types of arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty? Table 10.1 shows the distribution of the three systems of control among schools represented by deans, by student body presidents, and by samples of students. Although there are minor variations in the prevalence of the three control arrangements depending on which source of data we use, there is substantial agreement to the effect that about half of the schools have faculty centered control, about a quarter have honor systems, and about a quarter have judiciary bodies that hear cases of cheating, on which students serve.

TABLE 10.1

Distribution of the Three Types of Arrangement for Controlling Academic Dishonesty Among Schools, Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

	Deans	SBPs	Students
Arrangements for Control			
Honor system	20%	25%	31%
Judiciary body with students	25	24	21
Faculty-centered control	55	51	48
	100% (587)	100% (490)	100% (99)

What difference does the kind of arrangement for controlling academic dishonesty make in the amount of cheating at colleges? Table 10.2 shows the relationship between the system of control and the level of cheating for schools represented by deans, student body presidents, and students. Schools with honor systems have by far the lowest rate of academic dishonesty; schools with judiciary bodies on which students serve have the highest level of cheating; and schools with faculty-centered control fall inbetween.

The data from all three status groups show the same ordering of control arrangements; in fact, the relative differences in the per cent in the high cheating category among schools with various types of control arrangements are the same in the data from the three groups. The greatest difference in the per cent of high cheating schools is found between honor system schools and those with judiciary body arrangements. The next greatest is between honor system schools and those with faculty-centered control, and the least is between judiciary body schools and those with faculty-centered control.

TABLE 10.2

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangements for Control Among Schools Represented by Deans, SBPs, and Students

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating		
Arrangements for control	Deans	SBPs	Students
Honor system	28 (116)	27 (123)	10 (31)
Judiciary body with students	81 (145)	79 (120)	86 (21)
Faculty-centered control	71 (326)	71 (247)	66 (47)

Although the relationship between arrangements for control and level of academic dishonesty is very strong, perhaps stronger than that shown by any of the college characteristics discussed in the previous chapter, the explanation of this relationship is by no means as simple as it would at first seem. Student-centered control is clearly associated with lower cheating at a college, whereas faculty-centered control is associated with high cheating. This information alone suggests that student participation leads to effective control. But when responsibility for the control arrangement is shared by students and faculty (or administration) the level of academic dishonesty is the highest of all.

We alluded earlier to the relative effect of informal processes and formal arrangements on control of cheating. As indicators of the informal processes, we shall deal with two of the school characteristics examined in the last chapter, sex composition of the student body and size of school. These attributes are strongly associated with the cheating rate, they bear some relationship to the measures of school quality, and they refer to traditional bases on which American colleges are distinguished in the eyes of the public. We examine first the connection between sex composition and arrangements for control as they affect the level of cheating of the college.

Arrangements for Control, Sex Composition, and Level of Cheating

Before showing the joint effects of sex composition and arrangements for control, we must first consider whether male, female, and coed schools vary in the arrangements they use for controlling cheating. This relationship is shown in Table 10.3.

TABLE 10.3

Arrangements for Controlling Academic Dishonesty by Sex Composition of the Student Body Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs

	Deans			SBPs		
Arrangements for control	Female	Male	Coed	Female	Male	Coed
Honor systems	53%	30%	13%	52%	29%	17%
Judiciary bodies	6	15	31	7	29	29
Faculty-centered control	41	55	56	42	43	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(79)	(64)	(424)	(92)	(56)	(342)

Single-sex schools are much more likely to have honor systems than coed schools in each sample. In schools represented by deans and student body presidents, we find that the honor system is particularly characteristic of the women's colleges--a majority of these schools rely on the honor system. Men's colleges are not as apt to have honor systems as are women's colleges, but they are more likely to have them than are coed schools. The latter schools tend toward faculty-centered control.

The fact that single-sex schools more often have honor systems is thus another reason for their lower cheating rate. But does the sex composition of the student body have any significance for the level of cheating apart from their greater reliance on honor systems? To answer this we must examine simultaneously the effects of these variables on the cheating rate. This is done in Table 10.4.

TABLE 10.4

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangement for Control and Sex Composition Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating					
	Deans			SBPs		
Arrangements for control	Female	Male	Coed	Female	Male	Coed
Honor system	17 (42)	0 (19)	47 (55)	8 (48)	0 (16)	49 (59)
Judiciary bodies	[a] (5)	[a] (10)	83 (130)	[a] (6)	69 (16)	83 (98)
Faculty-centered control	31 (32)	71 (35)	75 (239)	29 (38)	75 (24)	79 (185)

[a] Too few cases to yield stable percentages.

Reading down the columns of this table, we see that the overall relationship between system of control and level of cheating holds for male, female and coed schools in each sample. In single sex colleges, in general, there are too few schools relying on mixed judiciary bodies to yield stable percentages. Therefore, the relevant comparison in these schools is between those relying on the honor system and those relying on faculty-centered control. In every instance, the schools using the honor system have a much lower rate of cheating. In coed schools, we find that the highest rate of cheating occurs at schools using judiciary bodies, but the chief difference is between judiciary bodies and faculty-centered control on the one hand, and the honor system on the other.

The honor system appears to be particularly effective in men's colleges. There is a difference of some 70 percentage points on the cheating variable between the male schools using the honor system and those relying on faculty-centered control in both samples. In female colleges, where the overall cheating rate tends to be low, the honor system makes a difference of only about 15 to 20 percentage points.

Reading across the rows in each sample, we see that system of control does not explain the significance of sex composition for the level of cheating. Single-sex schools continue to have lower cheating rates than coed schools when system of control is held constant and, within the single-sex group, where there are enough men's schools to permit meaningful comparisons, we find that the women's colleges tend to have lower rates of cheating than the men's schools.

It is possible to distinguish between the relative and absolute effectiveness of control systems. The absolute effectiveness of honor systems, for instance, may be measured by the per cent of schools falling into the high-cheating category; the lower the per cent, the greater the absolute effectiveness. Under this definition, honor systems are most effective at male schools, next most effective at female schools, and least effective at coed schools.

The relative effectiveness of a system of control can be seen by comparing the level of cheating at schools with one system of control with the level at schools using a different system. On this basis, the men's colleges again show the greatest effectiveness of the honor system, followed by the coed schools, and then by the women's colleges. Since the rate of cheating is generally low in women's colleges, it makes relatively little difference which system of control they use. (It can be seen that female schools without honor systems have lower rates of cheating than coed schools that do have them.) The honor system, then, is a method of control that has its greatest impact in men's colleges.

Arrangements for Control, School Size, and Level of Cheating

We know that the cheating rate increases with the size of the school. Is this because the large schools more frequently rely on the less efficacious systems of control-judiciary bodies and faculty-centered control? Table 10.5 shows the relationship between size and system of control in each of the samples of schools.

TABLE 10.5

Arrangements for Controlling Academic Dishonesty by Size of School Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs

	Deans				SBPs			
Arrangements for control	0-499	500-999	1000-2,999	3,000 or more	0-499	500-999	1000-2,999	3,000 or more
Honor system	22%	26%	18%	14%	31%	27%	22%	21%
Judiciary bodies	14	24	26	33	17	26	26	25
Faculty-centered	64	50	56	53	52	47	52	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(102)	(163)	(197)	(115)	(99)	(144)	(158)	(75)

Contrary to what we might have expected, size of school is not strongly related to the system of control. In both large and small schools in both samples, the most prevalent system is faculty-centered control. Small schools show some tendency to rely more on the honor system, and large schools more often have judiciary bodies. The honor system is the students' second most prevalent method of control in schools with less than 1000 whereas in those with 1000 or more, judiciary bodies rank second.

Since the relationships shown in Table 10.5 are not very strong, it is not likely that the significance of school size for the cheating rate can be explained entirely by the method of control used. But we must still see whether varying systems of control bear the same relationship to the level of cheating in different sized schools. In the deans' and student body presidents' samples we have enough cases to make fairly refined distinctions in size. The interaction of size and system of control on the cheating rate appears in Table 10.6.

TABLE 10.6

Per Cent of Schools with a High Level of Cheating by Arrangements for Control and Size of School Among Schools Represented by Deans and SBPs

	% of Schools with a High Level of Cheating							
Arrangements for control	Deans				SBPs			
	0-499	500-999	1,000-2,999	3,000 or more	0-499	500-999	1,000-2,999	3,000 or more
Honor system	23 (22)	21 (42)	24 (33)	63 (16)	19 (31)	18 (39)	26 (34)	63 (16)
Judiciary bodies	57 (14)	85 (40)	77 (52)	92 (38)	71 (17)	71 (38)	88 (42)	84 (19)
Faculty-centered control	52 (66)	66 (81)	79 (112)	90 (61)	47 (51)	67 (67)	85 (82)	90 (40)

The columns of Table 10.6 show that within every size category for each set of data, schools with honor systems continue to show lower rates of academic dishonesty than schools with other arrangements of control. Judiciary-body schools show the highest rate of academic dishonesty in three out of the four size categories for the deans' sample and, similarly, in three out of four size classes for the schools represented by student body presidents. And in every instance the sharpest difference is between the honor system schools and the others.

From the rows of the table we learn that size of school still has an important effect upon the cheating rate even when the formal method of control is taken into account. Among schools relying on faculty-centered control, the rate of cheating increases substantially with school size in both samples. Where judiciary bodies are the arrangement for control, school size does not show quite as strong or regular an association with cheating, although the direction of the relationship is the same.

Among schools with honor systems, size shows a more unusual relationship to the cheating level. In honor system schools represented by deans and student body presidents, we find that size shows little effect on the cheating rate until enrollment reaches 3000 students or more. Below this enrollment, the cheating rate is generally low and variations in size make little difference. But when enrollment exceeds 3000, the proportion of high-cheating schools increases substantially. This suggests that very large student bodies, presumably ones whose campuswide solidarity is weak, interfere with the efficacy of the honor system. Nonetheless, the honor system still maintains effectiveness at even these very large schools, for the cheating rate, although high, is lower than that at schools relying on judiciary bodies and faculty-centered control.

Honor systems, then, have some effectiveness in all size groups, but their absolute effectiveness is greater in small schools than in large ones. Their relative effectiveness, however, is just as great in the largest schools as in the smallest ones; in both the dean's and student body president's samples, there is almost a 30 point difference in the per cent of high cheating schools between the honor system and faculty-centered control. The relative effectiveness of honor systems is still greater in schools in the two medium-size categories. The greatest relative effectiveness of the honor system occurs in schools with enrollments of 1000 to 2999 students. In the samples represented by deans and student body presidents, schools of this size show differences of 55 to 60 percentage points in the cheating rate between honor systems and faculty-centered control arrangements.

On balance, it would seem that formal arrangements for the control of cheating have a greater impact on the rate of cheating than do the various informal processes represented in this analysis by the sex composition of the school and the size of the student body. Whatever the size or sex of the schools, it would seem that the campus community can make substantial progress in solving its problem of academic dishonesty by instituting student-centered arrangements of control like the honor system. The moral responsibility such a system places on the student body presumably restrains dishonesty by heightening both the individual student's own moral stance on cheating and the stance of his peers.

Chapter 11

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The time has come to take stock of our findings, to see what they contribute to our understanding of the problem of academic dishonesty and what may be done about it, and to identify questions that remain to be answered. We shall begin by summarizing the main findings of this report, and then we shall discuss some of the directions further analysis should take. In particular, we shall call attention to gaps in our knowledge of the problem that further analysis of the data on hand may help to fill.

Summary of Findings

Perhaps the most alarming finding of this study concerns the prevalence of academic dishonesty on American college campuses. Our data show that at least half the students in the sample have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty since coming to college. This is probably a conservative estimate for the sample, and an even more conservative one for the population of students attending regionally accredited colleges and universities across the country.[1]

Our data show that the magnitude of the problem is grossly underestimated by members of the campus community. Two and a half times as many students have cheated as student body presidents estimate, and more than three times as many have cheated as deans estimate. Even students themselves underestimate the proportion of cheaters in their midst; they tend to believe that only about half as many have cheated as their self-reports indicate.

---

[1] See Appendix D for an estimate of the level of cheating in the total college population.

Moreover, campus authorities say that only a small proportion of those who cheat, even according to their conservative estimates, are caught and punished. Also, only relatively lenient punishments are imposed for academic dishonesty at most schools. Seldom are students suspended or dismissed for violating norms of academic integrity, despite the fact that authorities consider this a serious disciplinary problem.

Since college cheating is so widespread, we might have expected to find that students do not consider cheating morally wrong. But this happens not to be the case. Although students vary in the extent to which they disapprove of cheating, they are in agreement that it is wrong on moral grounds, not simply because it may have unfortunate practical consequences for the offender.

In addition to personally disapproving of cheating, most students would express their disapproval if they encountered another student cheating. Furthermore, most students believe that their peers on campus also disapprove of cheating just as they themselves do. This evidence leaves little doubt that academic dishonesty is a form of behavior that most college students regard as deviant.

But if students disapprove of cheating, why do they engage in it? In fact, as we saw, not all students disapprove of cheating to the same extent, and the stronger the student's personal sense of disapproval, the less prone he is to cheat. Even among those who strongly disapprove, however, there are a number who have cheated, and among those who disapprove only weakly, a sizable number have withstood temptations to cheat. This led us to consider pressures toward cheating that might affect students' behavior in spite of their own moral stance.

The particular adaptations students make to academic demands and obligations is presumably one such pressure. Our data show that those who have difficulty adjusting to the role of student, as evidenced by poor study habits and low grades, are indeed more likely to cheat than the good students. But in view of the popular image of the cheater as a bad student--an image shared by college deans--it is surprising that the relationship is not stronger. When we control for other factors associated with cheating in college, academic performance has only a minor effect.

In addition to the specific adaptation students make to academic demands, they make a more general adaptation to college itself, which is reflected in the relative importance they attribute to the intellectual and social aspects of college life. This distinction between intellectual and social value-orientations appears in the kinds of friends they choose, their major field of study, the goals of education they consider important, and their involvement in campus social life. Our data show that those who value the social aspects of college life are more apt to cheat than those who emphasize intellectual interests and activities, even when we take their academic performance into account Presumably, students who place primary emphasis on intellectual matters are more committed to the academic life and more sensitive to the norms of academic integrity that govern it.

We found that the sources of college cheating can be traced to the high school experiences of students. Other studies have documented the antiacademic emphasis of the high school peer culture, and our findings indicate that college students who were more deeply involved in the adolescent society not only cheated in high school but also tend to continue cheating in college. Although the association is strong, the students who cheated in high school are not altogether the same ones who cheat in college. That some students stop cheating when they reach college and others take it up in college for the first time is explained to some extent by changes in their value-orientation and academic performance between high school and college. Students who improve their academic performance or shift from a social to an academic orientation tend to give up cheating when they get to college. But the most important determinant of changes in cheating behavior between high school and college is the level of disapproval of cheating among the student's college peers. Students who cheated in high school but are now at colleges with strong climates of disapproval of cheating are likely to give it up, and, conversely, students who did not cheat in high school but are attending colleges with weak climates of disapproval are apt to begin cheating in college.

As this finding suggests, students' college peers have a powerful effect on their cheating behavior. Students who perceive that their fellow students strongly disapprove of cheating are not nearly as likely to engage in academic dishonesty as those who believe that their peers are more tolerant of cheating. Normative constraints from peers have a much more pronounced effect on cheating than do personal value-orientations towards college or adjustment to academic demands. Moreover, the data show that students' cheating behavior is influenced not only by their close associates, but also by the broader peer group--the student body as a whole. Thus, no matter how strongly their close circle of peers disapprove, the students are less apt to cheat as the campus-wide climate of disapproval increases, and whatever the level of disapproval is among the student body as a whole, they less often cheat as disapproval becomes stronger among their immediate associates.

The discovery that a characteristic of the school itself--the climate of disapproval among the members of the student body--has such a powerful impact on the cheating behavior of students directed our attention to other differences among colleges that might affect their rate of academic dishonesty.

Elements of school quality, such as the selectivity of admissions, the faculty-student ratio, and the proportion of students living on campus, were found to be associated with low levels of cheating. By attracting abler and better prepared students, by subjecting them to stronger influences from the faculty and by creating a sense of solidarity through campus living arrangements, the schools of high quality would seem to foster a value climate in which norms of academic integrity are tied to an emphasis on intellectual and academic pursuits.

Differences in the size and make-up of the student body are also associated with the level of cheating of the college. Large schools have higher levels of cheating than small ones, and coeducational schools have higher levels than either men's or women's colleges, the latter having the lowest rates. The advantage of the single-sex schools seems partly due to their higher academic quality on the average. Yet other factors are at work to account for the relationship, including the specific arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty that are in force at the college.

The level of cheating is much lower at schools that place primary responsibility for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty in the hands of students and their elected representatives, as under the honor system, than at schools that rely on faculty-centered control or have a form of mixed control, in which faculty and students jointly participate. Honor systems are more prevalent at some kinds of schools than at others, and their presence makes a greater difference in the level of cheating depending on the characteristics of the schools than at others. But in all categories of school size and sex composition, schools with honor systems are less apt to have a high level of cheating than those with other arrangements for control. Moreover, the difference that the honor system makes in the level of cheating of the college is greater on the average, than the difference due to variations in school size or sex composition. Presumably, in return for the privileges and trust students are accorded under the honor system, they develop a stronger sense of commitment to norms of academic integrity and, thereby, a strong climate of peer disapproval of cheating emerges on the campus.

A summary of the major determinants of academic dishonesty as revealed in this report is presented in Table 11.1. They are divided into two groups: those affecting the cheating behavior of students and those relating to the level of cheating at the college. The table gives an indication of the relative effect of each determinant.

The estimate of the strength of the relationship has been arrived at by considering the associations with academic dishonesty when one or more other variables were controlled. A more refined statistical analysis would be required to evaluate precisely the contribution of the various determinants. In subsequent analysis, it would be desirable

TABLE 11.1

Major Determinants of Academic Dishonesty in College

Determinants of the Cheating Behavior of Students	Strength of Relationship
Peer disapproval of cheating (Disapproval among close associates and student body as a whole)	Strong
Personal disapproval of cheating	Strong
Prior history of cheating in in high school	Strong/Moderate
Value-orientation in college (criteria for selecting friends, choice of major, and involvement in campus social life)	Moderate
Adaptation to the role of student (study habits and academic performance)	Weak
Determinants of the Level of Cheating of the College	
Climate of peer disapproval of the college	Strong
Formal arrangements for controlling academic dishonesty (honor system vs. other arrangements)	Strong
Quality of school (proportion admitted, faculty-student ratio, and proportion living on campus)	Moderate
Sex composition of student body	Moderate
Size of enrollment	Moderate

to employ a form of multiple-regression analysis to further specify the role of each variable. Our present purpose, however, has been merely to locate and crudely evaluate the most important factors contributing to academic dishonesty in college.

Directions For Further Research

One of the fundamental purposes of research, as Robert K. Merton has pointed out, is to make explicit what we do not know; it should raise questions as well as answer them, and it should establish directions for further research.[2] Having summarized the main findings of this report, it is now incumbent upon us to identify questions that still remain to be answered and to indicate the directions further research should take to provide the answers. A moment's glance at the questionnaires presented in Appendices F and G will show that this report has dealt with only a fraction of the data obtained from deans, student body presidents, and students, and that many of the gaps in our knowledge can be filled by the work that still remains to be done with the material on hand.

For example, we have seen that the student's own moral stance on cheating plays a major role in his behavior. But we still need to understand how his personal sense of disapproval develops. Theories of early socialization and character development suggest that a strong personal stand against forms of deviant behavior has its roots in childhood experience and upbringing. We have collected data on the social background, early home life, and adolescent experiences of the students in our sample--information that should shed light on the development of their moral attitude toward cheating. Preliminary analysis of a part of these materials, reported in Appendix A, sheds some light on the way traditional social characteristics such as sex, religion, and socioeconomic status affect the student's likelihood of cheating. And yet, the effects of these and other social background factors on the student's personal sense of disapproval of cheating and on other components of what we have designated as the "cheating syndrome" remain to be explored.

---

[2] See Robert K. Merton, "Notes on Problem Finding in Sociology", in R. K. Merton, _et al._, (eds.) _Sociology Today_ (New York: Basic Books, 1959).

In the same fashion, work remains to be done on the genesis of cheating behavior in the college context. Just as we were able to contrast cheating in high school with cheating in college, so we can, with the data at hand, contrast cheating at earlier and later points in the student's college career. We have referred to college cheaters in the present tense, as if they were engaging in this form of deviant behavior at the time of the survey. But, of course, many of them were reporting cheating incidents that had occurred early in their college careers.

In addition to whether students have cheated since coming to college, our data also indicate whether they cheated during the last academic term and, if so, in what kinds of courses. Therefore, in subsequent analysis, we can identify the circumstances that lead some to start cheating and others to give it up. Moreover, it still remains to be seen whether students who engage in one kind of cheating differ in important respects from those who engage in another kind and whether those who cheat seldom differ significantly from those who cheat often.

In view of the importance of peer disapproval in deterring academic dishonesty, we need to know more about its sources on the campus. We can learn about its distribution by examining the information we have on the student's membership and participation in various clubs and associations. We also have a good deal of information on the students' five closest friends on campus, which remains to be analyzed. These materials should allow us to specify more precisely the role of peer groups, particularly the students' close associates, on their cheating behavior.

As well as pointing to the importance of social factors in explaining the cheating behavior of individual students, peer disapproval as a deterrent force also raises a number of questions about the college itself. How are certain kinds of colleges able to sustain strong climates of peer disapproval? Is it due to the kinds of students who come to the college or to the kind of environment and experience the college provides once the students reach the campus? As we note in Appendix A, schools with varying climates of peer disapproval tend to recruit differentially from the various strata that comprise the social structure. But, no doubt, they also differ in such important respects as the kinds of value climates they provide and the kinds of social relationships they foster on the campus. We have explored several college characteristics associated with the climate of peer disapproval and the level of cheating of the college, but much remains to be done. By adding information about colleges available in published sources to the data collected specifically for this study, we can develop more reliable indices of school quality, campus solidarity, and other aspects of colleges that may bear on their level of cheating.

The effectiveness of various institutional forms of control also needs further specification, especially because our findings in this area can have important practical implications. Although the data indicate that the honor system is considerably more effective than other forms of control in deterring academic dishonesty, we have not gone into the variations in the form this arrangement takes or the way in which it achieves its effectiveness. Honor systems vary in the kinds of misconduct besides academic dishonesty they cover and in the extent of the responsibility students have for detecting and sanctioning misbehavior. Further analysis should show how these variations in coverage and student responsibility are related to the effectiveness of this form of control.

Much remains to be learned about the conditions under which a new system of control can be instituted, and about the problems that arise in making a transition from one system of control to another. It would be a mistake to infer from our findings that all schools that do not have them should convert to the honor system in order to reduce the level of cheating on the campus. As we have seen, the relative effectiveness of the honor system is greater at some kinds of schools than at others, and, no doubt, they can be introduced more easily on some kinds of campuses than on others.

Ideally, we would want to conduct panel studies of schools that are shifting from one method of control to another to find out what problems arise during the process of transition and how the transition can be carried out at different kinds of schools. With comparatively little effort, however, our data can provide some insights about the way various kinds of control arrangements can be instituted at different kinds of schools. For example, we can find out when the schools in our sample that have honor systems adopted this form of control and, thus, compare schools that have had this system of control for some time with those that have only recently adopted it.

We would go on listing further lines of analysis suggested by the findings in this report, but these examples should be sufficient to indicate that much remains to be done, and can be done, with the data already collected.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Appendix A

SOCIAL BACKGROUND FACTORS AND CHEATING

In the body of this report we have ignored a class of variables that have consistently proven to be important in studies of social attitudes and behavior. These are characteristics such as sex, religion, and social class, which broadly locate individuals in the structure of society and reflect fundamental differences in the experiences and orientations they have. Also, these factors are presumed to be basic to the predispositions individuals develop and carry with them to various social contexts, predispositions that are reflected in consistency of attitudes and behavior from one area of social life to another.

Our evidence indicates, however, that sex, religion, and various indicators of social class have a relatively minor effect on academic dishonesty in college. Nevertheless, the nature of their effects is sufficiently interesting to merit our attention. To understand the way in which these factors contribute to the student's likelihood of engaging in academic dishonesty, we must examine their relationship to cheating in the context of a control variable. For this purpose, we shall use our measure of the climate of peer disapproval of cheating at the college, which, as we have seen, is a powerful determinant of cheating behavior. Taking this college characteristic into account will give us some idea of whether these background factors have an effect because they determine the kind of college students will attend or because they produce a predisposition toward academic dishonesty in the student above and beyond the college he attends.

Sex and Religion

There are several reasons for expecting that males would be more likely than females to cheat in college. Males are generally conceded to be under greater pressure to go to college. As adults, their prestige in the community and the material welfare of their families will depend largely on the kind of work they go into, and a college education is important for rank and mobility in the occupational sphere of society. This suggests that many males will be motivated to join the competition for a college degree even though they are poorly prepared to meet academic demands. As a group, then, males would seem to be under greater pressures to engage in academic dishonesty than their female counterparts. Moreover, since they stay in college longer than females on the average, males may find more occasion to cheat. To be sure, the increase in the proportion of students who have engaged in academic dishonesty with length of time in school is relatively slight (as can be seen from Table 4.13). Nevertheless, this differential in length of time in school between the sexes should result in a higher level of cheating among males than among females.

Along with the greater pressures operating on the males, there are, perhaps, greater constraints placed on females. Deviant behavior is generally less socially acceptable among females than among males in our society. This is reflected in the "double standard" that places greater restrictions on women in a variety of areas of social life. If women are generally held to stricter standards of conduct than men, we might expect to find that they are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty.

TABLE A.1

Per Cent Cheating by Sex for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

Sex	Total[*] sample	Climate of Peer Disapproval		
		Strong	Moderate	Weak
Male	54 (2,810)	28 (479)	53 (1,090)	66 (1,241)
Female	43 (2,568)	33 (1,104)	47 (1,060)	62 (404)

Table A.1 shows the relationships between sex and college cheating for the sample as a whole and within categories of peer disapproval of the college. As expected, we find that males are somewhat more likely than females to cheat in the total sample--a difference of 11 percentage points. But when we examine the relationship in the context of peer disapproval at the college, we find that it is much reduced and, in fact, reversed in one of the control categories. Males are slightly less apt to cheat than females in schools with strong climates of disapproval, and, although the relationship is in the expected direction, there is little difference between the sexes in schools with moderate or weak climates of disapproval.

The difference in cheating between males and females, then, is not due so much to pressures, opportunities, and constraints inherent to the two sex roles as it is to differences in the kinds of colleges the two sexes typically attend. The base figures in Table A.1 make this point clear. Females outnumber males by more than two to one at schools with strong climates of peer disapproval, whereas there are more than three times as many males as females at schools with weak climates of disapproval. Of course it may well be that the sex composition of the student body influences the strength of the climate of disapproval at the college, but the point is that given the climate of disapproval, the sex of the student has little, if any, bearing on his likelihood of cheating.

Religious background, like sex, is a factor that reflects basic social distinctions and one that is associated with a wide range of differences in attitudes and behavior. The members of the major religious groups tend to differ in social class and ethnic background, factors that affect the social experiences they have had and the adjustments and adaptations they have made to society. They also differ in the beliefs and ideas they hold about the nature of the world in which they live, differences that are presumed to have implications for their behavior. Perhaps then, this complex of factors represented by differences in religious background is related to academic dishonesty.

The relationships between religious background and college cheating for the total sample and within categories of peer disapproval are shown in Table A.2. Were we limited only to the figures for the total sample we might conclude that the more a religious group is in the minority, the more likely are its members to cheat, because the level of cheating is highest among Jews, next highest among Catholics, and lowest among Protestants in the sample as a whole.

TABLE A.2

Per Cent Cheating by Religious Background for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

Religious Background	Total sample	Climate of Peer Disapproval		
		Strong	Moderate	Weak
Protestant	47 (3,372)	30 (953)	50 (1,527)	62 (892)
Catholic	52 (1,394)	36 (508)	50 (378)	70 (508)
Jewish	55 (309)	24 (54)	50 (94)	68 (161)

But when we take into account the kinds of colleges they are attending, as reflected by the climate of peer disapproval, we find that the differences among the religious groups become inconsistent. At schools with a strong climate of disapproval, Jews cheat less than Catholics or Protestants, at schools with a moderate climate of disapproval there are no differences whatsoever among the three religious groups, and only in schools with a weak climate of peer disapproval do Jews and Catholics show a slightly higher level of cheating than Protestants. In none of the three kinds of schools is the ordering of religious groups in terms of cheating the same as it is in the sample as a whole. In fact, in none of the categories do Jews show the highest level of cheating, and in only one do the Protestants show the lowest level.

The base figures in Table A.2 show that the more a religious group is in the minority, the greater the proportion of that group attending schools with a weak climate of peer disapproval of cheating. Over half of the Jews in our sample are attending such schools, somewhat more than a third of the Catholics, and only slightly more than a quarter of the Protestants.[1] Thus, religious background, like sex, shows a relationship to cheating in the total sample because of the kinds of schools students with differing religious backgrounds attend. The distribution of students of varying religions to different kinds of colleges may reflect the more restricted educational opportunities and choices that members of minority groups face.

---

[1] It is noteworthy that Catholics are much more likely than Protestants to attend schools that have either a strong or a weak climate of peer disapproval of cheating. This at least suggests that Catholic schools vary considerably on this dimension of climate of peer disapproval. This point merits attention in subsequent analysis.

Indicators of Social Class

Differences in social class are associated with broad differences in interests and values among families and with differences in patterns of child rearing. Children from higher social-class backgrounds may, on the average, be better prepared for college work. They have probably had better secondary schooling and more encouragement in their schoolwork than students from less privileged families. They may also have a stronger commitment to honesty in their academic work. The lower classes are reputed to place less emphasis on strict adherence to norms of honesty than the upper classes. Students from lower-class backgrounds, then, may feel greater academic pressure in college and at the same time be less committed to an honest approach to their course work.

We shall examine several dimensions of the students' social class--their parents' occupation, income, and education--as they relate to cheating in college. Table A.3 shows the relationship between fathers' occupation and the students' cheating behavior in college for the total sample and at schools with differing climates of peer disapproval. For the total sample, the proportion in cheating steadily increases, the lower the occupational status of the father. Although the overall difference is only 9 percentage points, the consistent, step-by-step increase suggests that social class as reflected in the occupation of the student's father does have some bearing on the student's tendency to cheat.

Once again, however, the relationship virtually disappears when we control for the climate of peer disapproval of the college. Among students attending schools with strong and moderate climates of disapproval, there is no discernible relationship; only in those schools where the climate of disapproval is weak do we find a relationship between fathers' occupation and cheating comparable to the one shown in the total sample. Although it is not as obvious in Table A.3 as it was in the previous two tables, the base figures show the same disproportionate allocation of students to different kinds of schools. Students whose fathers are higher on the occupational ladder are more apt to attend schools with a strong climate of peer disapproval. Thus, it would appear that social-class background, at least as represented by fathers' occupation, shows a relationship to cheating in the total sample not because of differences in personal disposition toward academic dishonesty, but because of differences in the climate of peer disapproval at schools students from different social classes attend.

Parents' income as a measure of social class background tells a slightly different story. As Table A.3 shows, there is no relationship between parents' income and college cheating in the total sample nor within categories of peer disapproval of the college. Thus, social class, as reflected in parents' income plays little or no part in

TABLE A.3

Per Cent Cheating by Fathers' Occupation for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

Fathers' occupation	Total sample	Climate of Peer Disapproval: Strong	Moderate	Weak
Professional	45 (1,226)	32 (405)	49 (478)	58 (337)
Executive, managerial, official	49 (1,824)	33 (585)	50 (714)	64 (525)
Other white collar	51 (810)	31 (226)	52 (333)	69 (251)
Blue collar	54 (1,444)	30 (343)	49 (593)	69 (508)

determining the student's likelihood of cheating in college. It neither affects students' predispositions toward academic dishonesty, nor does it figure in the process whereby students are distributed among colleges with varying climates of peer disapproval.

TABLE A.4

Per Cent Cheating by Parents' Income for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

		Climate of Peer Disapproval		
Parents income	Total sample	Strong	Moderate	Weak
Less than $5,000	50 (793)	29 (168)	46 (335)	68 (290)
$5,000-$7,5000	54 (958)	32 (251)	54 (399)	71 (305)
$7,5000-$10,000	50 (873)	33 (225)	51 (357)	63 (291)
$10,000-$15,000	48 (824)	30 (234)	51 (352)	60 (238)
$15,000 or more	48 (853)	32 (313)	51 (279)	66 (261)

A third dimension of the class background of a student is the education of his parents. We have data from the students on the educational attainment of both their fathers and their mothers. Tables A.5 and A.6 show the relationship between the student's cheating behavior in college and father's education and mother's education, respectively. In both tables, the relationship is shown for the total sample and within climates of peer disapproval. In the sample as a whole, students whose fathers graduated from college are less likely to cheat than those whose fathers are not college graduates; and students whose mothers have had at least some college are less likely to cheat than those whose mothers have not gone beyond high school. In neither case is the association strong, although it is a few percentage points greater with mothers' education than with fathers' education.

TABLE A.5

Per Cent Cheating by Fathers' Education for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

Fathers' education	Total sample	Climate of Peer Disapproval		
		Strong	Moderate	Weak
Did not finish high school	51 (1,379)	30 (307)	49 (557)	66 (515)
High school graduate	52 (1,204)	35 (301)	53 (513)	64 (390)
Some college	51 (955)	35 (297)	51 (413)	69 (245)
College graduate	45 (1,823)	29 (672)	48 (660)	62 (491)

TABLE A.6

Per Cent Cheating by Mothers' Education for the Total Sample and Controlling for Climate of Peer Disapproval of the College

Mothers' education	Total sample	Climate of Peer Disapproval		
		Strong	Moderate	Weak
Did not finish high school	53 (1,016)	35 (218)	49 (406)	66 (392)
High school graduate	53 (1,856)	34 (475)	53 (794)	68 (587)
Some college	46 (1,038)	32 (339)	47 (419)	60 (280)
College graduate	44 (1,430)	27 (536)	48 (521)	62 (373)

Controlling for climate of peer disapproval of the college generally reduces the overall effect of both father's and mother's education. Students whose fathers have graduated from college still show the lowest level of cheating in each of the control categories, but the differences are only 1 or 2 percentage points. At schools with the same level of peer disapproval, students whose mothers have had at least some college continue to show a lower level of cheating than those whose mothers have not, but here too the differences amount to only a few percentage points. Thus, when we take into account the climate of peer disapproval of the college the relatively weak relationships in the total sample are reduced even further, although it is not eliminated altogether.

Generally speaking, the background factors we have examined in this appendix show only weak relationships to academic dishonesty in college. The effects they do have are due more to the kinds of schools students attend than to the personal dispositions they develop as a result of their particular social background. In fact, in most cases there is no difference in likelihood of cheating among students of different social backgrounds who are attending the same kind of school. Needless to say, important questions remain about how background factors determine which kinds of schools students are more prone to attend and about how the social backgrounds of students attending a college may affect its climate of peer disapproval of cheating. These issues, however, must await further attention in subsequent reports on these data.

Appendix B

INDICES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY FOR THE COLLEGE

For the 99 schools represented by samples of students, we have aggregated the self-reported cheating behavior of the students in the sample at each school to get a measure of the level of academic dishonesty for the college. "High cheating schools" are those at which 50 per cent or more of the students in our sample from the school have cheated since coming to college. In order to gauge the amount of cheating at schools represented by deans and student body presidents, however, we must rely on their perception and judgments. Several questions were asked about the problem of academic dishonesty, including two that refer directly to the amount of cheating that goes on at their colleges. One asked them to estimate roughly what percentage of the student body at their school cheat or plagiarize. (Deans' and student body presidents' responses to this item appear in Chapter 2, Table 2.3.) The other question asked them to indicate how the amount of cheating and plagiarism at their college compares with the level at other colleges across the country.

These two items were trichotomized, each was scored "0" for low, "1" for medium, and "2" for high, and then the two were combined to yield a five-point index. In order to make the resulting distribution of index scores as nearly equivalent as possible for deans and student body presidents representing the same schools, we chose somewhat different cutting points for the two status groups on the question about the estimated proportion of cheaters. Our earlier analysis showed that deans tend to give lower estimates than do student body presidents.[1] Only those who gave no answer on both of the component items were not classified; respondents who failed to answer one of the two questions were placed in the median category on that item. Thus, the extreme high and low categories on the five point scale are reserved for those respondents who indicate that the level of cheating at their school was either high or low on both component items.

Table B.1 presents the association between the two component items for deans and for student body presidents and the resulting distribution of index scores for the two status groups.[2] For both deans and student body presidents, there is a strong association between their responses to these two items. The relationship is slightly stronger for the student body presidents than for the deans, however.

If the perceptions of deans and student body presidents have a basis in reality, then we should find an association between these two indices for schools represented by both parties. As we noted in Appendix C, questionnaires were received from both deans and student body presidents at 290 colleges and universities. Table B.2 shows the extent to which index scores of deans and student body presidents from these 290

---

[1] The difference between the estimates of deans and student body presidents from the same schools is even greater than is the difference between the estimates of all deans and all student body presidents. Whereas the median estimate of the per cent of students at their college who cheat for matched student body presidents is 20 per cent, the same as for all student body presidents, the median estimate for matched deans is 12 per cent, 3 per cent less than the estimate for all deans.

[2] The distribution of index scores includes those who answered only one item, classified as we have indicated.

TABLE B.1

Association Between Component Items and Resulting Index Scores for Deans and Student Body Presidents

Deans	The respondent says that, compared to average the amount of cheating and plagiarism, his school is:				Distribution of Index Scores		
Estimate of per cent who cheat or plagiarize	Quite a bit lower	Somewhat lower	Average or more	No answer	Score		#
0 - 10%	104	55	35	9	Low	0	104
11% - 20%	19	39	49	8		1	100
						2	118
21% or more	15	42	143	6		3	132
No answer	17	21	35	39	High	4	143
					Not Classified		39
Student Body Presidents					Total		626
Estimate of per cent who cheat or plagiarize					Score		#
0 - 10%	95	33	18	10	Low	0	95
11% - 34%	44	72	58	11		1	92
						2	110
35% or more	4	24	99	6		3	94
No answer	5	6	6	12	High	4	99
					Not Classified		12
					Total		502

schools agree. (Since we only make the distinction between high and low cheating schools in the text of the report, the table shows the index scores in dichotomized form.) The table shows substantial agreement between deans and student body presidents. In only about a quarter of the schools do they disagree.

TABLE B.2

Association Between Cheating Index Scores for Deans and Student Body Presidents from the Same Colleges

	Student Body Presidents	
Deans	Low (2, 3, and 4)	High (0,1)
Low (2, 3, and 4)	72	36
High (0, 1)	32	129

Of course, the fact that deans and student body presidents from the same school tend to agree about the level of cheating at their college does not give positive assurance that these measures are accurate. The two parties may agree, but both be wrong. By comparing the index scores of deans and student body presidents with the level of cheating as determined by the data from samples of students at those colleges represented in both pairs of samples, we can further test these measures.

Table B.3 shows the extent to which the measure based on deans' perceptions and the one based on student body presidents' perceptions agree with the level of cheating according to students' self-reports.

TABLE B.3

Schools Classified in Terms of Level of Cheating by Deans and Students and by Student Body Presidents and Students

	Deans	
Per cent cheating in the sample of students	High (2, 3, and 4)	Low (0, 1)
50% or more	36	16
Less than 50%	22	24
	Student Body Presidents	
	High (2, 3, and 4)	Low (0, 1)
50% or more	32	8
Less than 50%	18	22

Deans' and student body presidents' index scores do not show quite as much agreement with students' self-reports as they do with one another. Schools are classified the same way in two out of three cases by student body presidents and samples of students and in about three out of five cases by deans and samples of students. Although these associations are not particularly strong, in both cases they indicate that the measures based on the responses of deans and student body presidents definitely reflect differences that are manifested in the actual cheating behavior of students at their colleges.

With this evidence we can be satisfied that our three measures of academic dishonesty for the college do, in large part, reflect the actual level of cheating. Although they may be imprecise, all three measures of level of cheating of the college show similar relationships to other variables. This is but another illustration of the principal of the interchangeability of indices in social research.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Appendix C

THE SAMPLES

Data for this study were collected in two stages. First, information was gathered from deans and student body presidents at a large number of colleges and universities across the country, and then, a year later, information was collected from samples of students at each of 99 colleges represented by deans and student body presidents at the earlier stage. (The 99 colleges represented by samples of students are listed in Appendix E.)

Sample of Deans and of Student Body Presidents: Stage One

In April of 1962, questionnaires were mailed to the "Dean of Students" and the "Student Body President" at each of 1134 colleges and universities in the United States, all four-year, degree-granting institutions that had been accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations in the Fall of 1961.[1] Early in May, followup questionnaires were sent to all nonrespondents, and late in May, second followup questionnaires were sent to both parties at schools from which neither had responded by that time. By the middle of June, when returns were cut off, 50 per cent of the total sample had returned questionnaires--56 per cent of the deans and 44 per cent of the student body presidents. The following figures describe the sample:

---

[1] See Accredited Institutions of Higher Education in the United States, September 1961 (New York: National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies, 1961). The 1961 directory lists 1150 institutions, but this seems to include at least 14 junior colleges that were not differentiated from four-year schools by the member accrediting agencies.

1128	questionnaires were returned in all	50% of total sample
626	by deans	56% of deans sampled
502	by student body presidents	44% of SBPs sampled
838	colleges and universities are represented in the sample	74% of all schools
290	by both dean and student body president	26% of all schools
336	by dean alone	29% of all schools
212	by student body president alone	19% of all schools

Later in this appendix this sample is compared with the universe of all regionally accredited colleges and universities in the United States.

Sample of Students: Stage Two

Several considerations influenced the design for sampling students. First, we wanted to sample students from a large number of colleges and universities in order to take account of differences in institutional context that have an effect on students. Secondly, we wanted to have an adequate sample of students from each school to be able to characterize the school itself and particularly its student body by the responses of the students from that school. And, thirdly, we wanted to have enough schools to permit multivariate analysis, with the school itself as the unit. On the basis of these considerations and the limits set by time and financial support, it was decided to sample students from 100 different schools, trying for a sample of at least 50 students from each school.

The deans and student body presidents were asked about the possibility of their colleges participating further in this study by having students at their schools surveyed. A majority of the respondents (53 per cent of the deans and 71 per cent of the student body presidents) answered affirmatively.

Among those schools from which deans expressed an interest in further participation, 180 were selected as a pool of candidates from which the final sample of 100 schools would be chosen. This pool consisted of all 150 schools at which deans had expressed interest in stage two and a questionnaire had been received from the student body president as well as the dean during stage one. We also included an additional 30 schools at which the dean had expressed interest in stage two but no questionnaire had been received from the student body president in stage one. Priority was given to schools represented by both parties, because it was thought that the additional data provided by the student body president's questionnaire might prove useful in later analysis. The additional 30 schools represented only by deans were selected so as to make the pool more representative of the universe of regionally accredited colleges and universities in terms of size of enrollment, sex composition, and type of institutional control.

In the Fall of 1962, letters were mailed to deans at the 180 schools, asking for their further assistance and cooperation in our research. Each dean received the following request:

"WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR SENDING US EITHER:

(A) A listing or directory of the names and local addresses of all the undergraduate students presently enrolled in your college, from which we will select students to receive the questionnaire; or, if such a list cannot be sent or if no list or directory is available,

(B) The names and local addresses of 75 students selected from the record of all undergraduate students presently enrolled in your college so that every nth name is taken from the record where n equals the total undergraduate student body divided by 75. (To

> illustrate this procedure: if the size of the undergraduate student body is 750 students, n equals 750 divided by 75, which is 10. Every nth student on the record will be the 10th, 20th, 30th, and so on.]"

In all, deans from 145 schools sent either student directories or names and addresses that they had selected according to alternative (B). Of these directories and lists, 120 were received in time for the school to be considered for our sample of 100. In selecting the final sample of 100 schools, all 40 schools at which the dean had gone to the trouble of compiling a list of students according to the procedure outlined in alternative (B) were included. Of the remaining 80 schools from which deans had sent directories, 60 were chosen so as to make the sample of 100 as nearly representative as possible of the universe of regionally accredited institutions. In cases in which schools were alike in other respects, priority was given to those represented by both dean and student body president in stage one. Of the 100 schools eventually selected, 81 were represented by both the dean and the student body president and 19 were represented by the dean alone.

In mid-February 1963, questionnaires were sent to 9037 students on 100 different campuses. Questionnaires were sent to all students included on the lists supplied us by deans at the 40 schools, about 75 students per school. At the remaining 60 schools from which directories were received, we sampled 100 students at each according to the procedure specified in alternative (B). In mid-March, followup letters were sent to all nonrespondents and a followup questionnaire was sent to nonrespondents at the schools where deans had drawn the sample. A month later, followup questionnaires were sent to nonrespondents at the six colleges from which fewer than 30 completed questionnaires had been received.

By our cut-off date in mid-May, we had received 5432 completed questionnaires from students: a response rate of 60 per cent. Unfortunately, at one college questionnaires failed to reach many of the students to whom they were mailed. This particular college has a cooperative work-study program and many of those in our sample were away from the campus on their work assignments. Since only 10 questionnaires were received from students at this school it was dropped from the study. Thus, our analysis deals with 99 schools and 5422 students. The 99 schools participating in stage two are listed in Appendix E along with the sample size and response rate for each.

Table C.1 shows the distribution of schools by number of students returning questionnaires. Seventy schools are represented by 50 or more students; ninety schools are represented by 40 or more students.

TABLE C.1

Number of Colleges and Universities Represented by Various Numbers of Students

Number of Students	Number of Colleges and Universities
29 - 39	9
40 - 49	20
50 - 59	38
60 - 69	22
70 - 84	10

The Samples Compared With The Universe

Our procedures for gathering data from deans, student body presidents, and students may well have introduced biases into the three samples of schools. By comparing the samples with the universe of colleges and universities on selected characteristics we can identify possible biases and determine the extent to which the samples are unrepresentative in these respects. The characteristics on which these comparisons will be made are size of undergraduate enrollment, sex composition of the student body, type of institutional control, and geographical region.[2]

The distributions of the three samples and of the universe according to size of the undergraduate enrollment of the college is shown in Table C.2. The three samples are not very different from the universe in terms of school size. Schools represented by student body presidents show a pattern closest to that of all accredited schools. The

TABLE C.2

Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Size of Undergraduate Enrollment

	Schools Represented by			
Size of Enrollment	Students	Deans	SBPs	All Accredited Schools
0 - 499	20%	18%	19%	21%
500 - 999	24	28	31	30
1000 - 2999	30	35	34	33
3000 or more	26	19	16	16
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(99)	(626)	(502)	(1134)

---

[2] Schools are characterized on the basis of data from the "College Characteristics Data Bank" being developed at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. The data were current as of 1961 and come from various information sources.

deans' sample, although similar to the universe, shows a slight bias toward larger schools. The two larger size categories are slightly overrepresented, whereas the two smaller size categories are slightly underrepresented. Schools represented by samples of students deviate more from the distribution of the universe than do the other two. The very large schools (3000 or more students) are overrepresented in this sample at the expense of the three smaller size categories, particularly the category of 500 to 999 students. Thus, considered together, two of the three samples tend slightly to overrepresent the schools with larger student bodies.

The three samples are also similar to the universe with respect to the sex composition of the student bodies, as shown in Table C.3. Interestingly enough, each sample overrepresents schools with a different kind of sex composition. The student body presidents' sample overrepresents women's schools, the deans' sample overrepresents coed schools,

TABLE C.3

Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Sex Composition of the Student Body

	Schools Represented by			
Sex Composition	Students	Deans	SBPs	All Accredited Schools
Male	16%	11%	11%	11%
Female	16	13	19	16
Coed	68	76	70	73
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(99)	(626)	(502)	(1134)

and the students' sample overrepresents men's schools. The deviations from the universe are not great (6 percentage points), although, just as with school size, the schools represented by samples of students show the greatest deviation.

Once again, the three samples of schools are similar to the universe with respect to type of institutional control. Table C.4 shows that the three samples deviate about equally from the universe.

TABLE C.4

Various Samples Compared to the Universe of Accredited Colleges and Universities in Terms of Type of Institutional Control

	Schools Represented by			
Type of Control	Students	Deans	SBPs	All Accredited Schools
Nondenominational	29%	24%	25%	24%
Protestant	23	23	27	24
Catholic	14	16	17	19
Public	34	37	31	33
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(99)	(626)	(502)	(1134)

As in the case of sex composition, here, too, each sample slightly overrepresents schools with a different kind of institutional control. Deans overrepresent public schools, student body presidents overrepresent Protestant schools, and students overrepresent nondenominational schools. In this instance, however, all three samples slightly underrepresent Catholic schools. The deviation is not very great (5 percentage points at the most), nevertheless, this particular bias is present in all three samples.

When it comes to regional location, there is a striking similarity between each of the samples and the universe, as can be seen from Table C.5. In fact the samples of deans and of student body presidents do not deviate by more than 1 percentage point from the universe of all accredited colleges in any of the nine regions. The schools represented by students are also distributed very much like the universe in seven of the nine regional categories. But this sample overrepresents schools in the West North Central region and underrepresents those in the East North Central region (deviating by 6 percentage points in each case). Thus, the samples of schools, especially two of them, are not very different from the universe in terms of geographical location.

TABLE C.5

Distribution of Samples and Universe by Geographical Region

	Schools Represented by			
Region	Students	Deans	SBPs	All Accredited Schools
New England	9%	9%	9%	9%
Middle Atlantic	20	18	20	19
South Atlantic	17	14	16	15
East North Central	10	16	16	16
East South Central	8	7	5	7
West North Central	18	12	13	12
West South Central	7	9	7	8
Mountain	3	5	4	4
Pacific	8	10	10	10
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Schools	(99)	(626)	(502)	(1134)

On balance, there is considerable likeness between the samples and the universe at least in these four respects. We find some biases, but for the most part, they are not consistent from sample to sample, nor are they very large. The only bias we find common to all three samples is the very slight tendency to underrepresent catholic schools, and the largest bias in any of the samples is the tendency to overrepresent very large schools (by just 10 percentage points), which occurs among the schools represented by students.

Appendix D

A PROJECTION OF THE LEVEL OF CHEATING BASED ON SIZE OF SCHOOL

The level of academic dishonesty reported among the students in our sample is only a rough approximation of the amount of cheating that actually goes on in the population of American college students. There are problems of inaccurate and incomplete information: we have no assurance that all students who cheated were willing to report their cheating behavior in the questionnaire, nor can we be satisfied that those who did report having cheated gave a full account of the cheating they had engaged in. In addition, a sizeable number of students failed to return questionnaires and, in many cases, this failure to participate may have been due to a reluctance to admit cheating behavior.

If these considerations presented no problem--if all students had returned questionnaires and if they all had given complete and accurate accounts of their behavior in response to our questions there would still be difficulties in determining the level of cheating for the population of college students, which stem from the unrepresentativeness of the sample. Although the students on the 99 campuses were selected in a way that closely approximates random sampling, the schools themselves were selected in several steps that undoubtedly introduce biases.

Appendix C shows that the sample of 99 schools approximates the universe of all regionally accredited colleges and universities in several respects, but there may well be other respects in which the sample is unrepresentative, which may be relevant to the amount of academic dishonesty there is on the campus. One obvious bias is our decision to use only schools at which the dean was sufficiently interested in the problem of academic dishonesty to participate in the study. In addition, sampling approximately equal numbers of students from schools of all sizes, as we did, tends to make our sample unrepresentative of the population of students. Although the distribution of schools in the universe and in our sample match fairly well in terms of size of undergraduate enrollment (as shown in Table C.2), the proportion of students we have from schools of various sizes does not match the proportion actually attending various sized schools. Thus, we have almost as many students from schools with an enrollment of less than 500 as we do from those with 3000 or more, whereas there are actually 15 times as many students enrolled in the larger sized schools.

For these reasons the level of academic dishonesty among the students in our sample may not be a good estimate or approximation of the level in the population of students at regionally accredited schools. There is at least one respect, however, in which we can compensate for an important bias in our sample. In Chapter 9 we saw that the level of cheating was higher among students attending large schools than it was among those at small schools, and we know that our decision to take about the same number of students from schools of all sizes overrepresents students from small schools in our sample. Therefore, the level of cheating in our sample is lower than it would be if students from larger schools were proportionately represented.

By weighting students' responses according to the size of the school they attend, we can compensate for the discrepancy between our sample and the universe.[1] Table D.1 shows the distribution of the universe and of our sample of students by size of school. It also shows, for each size category, the proportion of the universe included in our sample and the weights assigned to students' responses on the basis of these proportions.

TABLE D.1

Distribution of Students by Size of School for the Universe and the Sample, Proportion of Universe Included in the Sample, and Weights by School Size

School size	Number of students in the universe[a]	Number of students in the sample	Proportion of universe included in the sample	Sample weights
499 or less	83,615	1140	.01363	1.0
500 - 999	249.068	1432	.00575	2.4
1000 - 2999	617,079	1477	.00239	5.7
3000 or more	1,232,977	1373	.00111	12.3

[a] These enrollment figures characterize the 1134 regionally accredited colleges and universities as of Fall 1961. The number of students in each size category is the sum of the undergraduate enrollments of all schools in that category according to data in the College Characteristics Data Bank.

Students' responses to the three major questions about cheating behavior dealt with in Chapter 4 are presented in Table D.2 for the weighted and unweighted samples. In addition, the table presents responses to each of the component items of the question about four forms of academic dishonesty. For the question about recent cheating incidents, it shows the per cent engaging in a cheating incident during the most recent term of study.

---

[1] Such a weighting procedure will compensate not only for the discrepancy caused by taking approximately equal samples from schools of all sizes, but also for the discrepancy in the distribution of schools between the universe and the sample, which was shown in Table C.2.

TABLE D.2

Per Cent Cheating According to Various Questions for the Sample And for the Sample Weighted To Represent the Universe

	The sample	The sample weighted to represent all students
% engaging in one or more of the four forms of academic dishonesty	50	55
Copying on an exam	29	35
Plagiarizing on a paper	28	29
Turning in another student's work	14	17
Using crib notes on an exam	13	16
% engaging in one or more of the 13 specific acts	75	79
% Reporting a cheating incident in which they took part	39	44
% Reporting a cheating incident last term in which they took part	24	27

As we expected, when our sample is weighted to represent the universe, the level of academic dishonesty is higher. On the three major questions and on all component items a greater proportion of students have cheated in the weighted sample. The increase in the level of cheating that this weighting produces is not great, however. The three major questions show about 5 per cent more students cheating, and the various component items show about 3 per cent more than in the original sample.[2] Since our weighting procedure compensates for only one of several possibly relevant biases, however, the approximately 5 per cent higher level of cheating in the weighted sample cannot be considered an accurate estimate of the level of academic dishonesty among all students attending regionally accredited colleges and universities; it is simply a better estimate than the unweighted sample provides.

---

[2] Size of school may be associated not only with the overall level of cheating but also with the prevalence of different kinds of cheating. If we examine the first two component items under the four forms of academic dishonesty, we see that giving more weight to the responses of students from larger schools has the effect of increasing the per cent who copy on exams more than the per cent engaging in any of the other specific forms of academic dishonesty or, for that matter, than the per cent admitting cheating on any of the three major questions. Although all kinds of cheating increase with school size, copying on exams increases more and plagiarizing on papers increases less than other kinds.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Appendix E

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REPRESENTED BY STUDENTS

Listed below are the 99 schools represented by samples of students. The schools are listed by geographical region and within each region are ordered alphabetically. The number of students who were mailed questionnaires, the number who returned them, and the response rate are shown for each school.

Name of college or university	Location	Number mailed questionnaires	Number returning questionnaires	Response rate (%)
New England States				
Albertus Magnus College	New Haven, Conn.	84	54	64
Atlantic Union College	South Lancaster, Mass.	100	57	57
Bowdoin College	Brunswick, Me.	75	51	68
Hebrew Teachers College	Brookline, Mass.	100	72	72
Holy Cross, College of the	Worcester, Mass.	84	65	77
Northeastern University	Boston, Mass.	77	51	66
Trinity College	Hartford, Conn.	81	66	81
Wesleyan University	Middletown, Conn.	100	66	66
Yale College, Yale Univ.	New Haven, Conn.	100	65	65
Middle Atlantic States				
Alfred University	Alfred, N.Y.	75	57	76
Brooklyn College	Brooklyn, N.Y.	75	48	64
Carnegie Institute of Technology	Pittsburgh, Pa.	75	46	61
Colgate University	Hamilton, N.Y.	100	61	61
Columbia College, Columbia University	New York, N.Y.	100	62	62
Hamilton College	Clinton, N.Y.	100	67	67
Haverford College	Haverford, Pa.	100	72	72
Keuka College	Keuka Park, N.Y.	100	74	74
Long Island University	Brooklyn, N.Y.	75	40	53
Lycoming College	Williamsport, Pa.	75	50	67

Name of college or university	Location	Number mailed questionnaires	Number returning questionnaires	Response rate (%)
Muhlenberg College	Allentown, Pa.	75	56	75
Newark College of Engineering	Newark, N.J.	75	53	71
Pennsylvania, University of, College of Arts and Sciences	Philadelphia, Pa.	75	45	60
Rosemont College	Rosemont, Pa.	100	61	61
Russell Sage College	Troy, N.Y.	100	74	74
St. Vincent College	Latrobe, Pa.	75	58	77
Trenton State College	Trenton, N.J.	100	55	55
US Merchant Marine Academy	Kings Point, N.Y.	100	42	42
South Atlantic States				
Appalachian State Teachers College	Boone, N.C.	75	43	57
Bethany College	Bethany, W. Va.	75	29	39
Bridgewater College	Bridgewater, Va.	75	47	63
Davidson College	Davidson, N.C.	100	64	64
Emory University	Atlanta, Ga.	100	61	61
Guilford College	Guilford College, N.C.	100	55	55
Hood College	Frederick, Md.	100	84	84
Howard University	Washington, D. C.	75	34	45
Miami, University of	Coral Gables, Fla.	76	39	51
Morgan State College	Baltimore, Md.	72	35	49
North Carolina, University of	Chapel Hill, N.C.	75	38	51
Radford College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Radford, Va.	100	68	68
Salem College	Winston-Salem, N.C.	100	76	76
State Teachers College	Salisbury, Md.	80	57	71
Virginia, University of	Charlottesville, Va.	100	50	50
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Blacksburg, Va.	100	65	65
Wesleyan College	Macon, Ga.	75	46	61
Women's College, Duke University	Durham, N.C.	75	51	68
North East Central States				
Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti, Mich.	100	65	65
Marion College	Indianapolis, Ind.	75	56	75
Michigan College of Mining and Technology	Houghton, Mich.	100	71	71

Name of college or university	Location	Number mailed questionnaires	Number returning questionnaires	Response rate (%)
Nazareth College	Nazareth, Mich.	75	56	75
Northern Michigan College	Marquette, Mich.	100	55	55
Notre Dame, University of	Notre Dame, Ind.	100	72	72
Rockford College	Rockford, Ill.	100	54	54
Viterbo College	La Crosse, Wisc.	76	64	84
Wabash College	Crawfordsville, Ind.	81	63	78
Wayne State University	Detroit, Mich.	75	48	64
South East Central States				
Centre College of Kentucky	Danville, Ky.	100	61	61
Kentucky, University of	Lexington, Ky.	100	50	50
King College	Bristol, Tenn.	75	44	59
Middle Tennessee State College	Murfreesboro, Tenn.	75	45	60
Mississippi, University of	University, Miss.	100	54	54
Southern Mississippi, University of	Hattiesburg, Miss.	75	38	51
Tuskegee Institute	Tuskegee, Ala.	100	40	40
Ursuline College	Louisville, Ky.	100	52	52
North West Central States				
Bethel College and Seminary	St. Paul, Minn.	100	73	73
Briar Cliff College	Sioux City, Iowa	100	57	57
Clarke College	Dubuque, Iowa	75	67	89
Cornell College	Mount Vernon, Iowa	100	67	67
Dana College	Blair, Neb.	100	57	57
Fort Hays Kansas State College	Hays, Kansas	100	36	36
Graceland College	Lamoni, Iowa	100	64	64
Lincoln University	Jefferson City, Mo.	100	39	39
Luther College	Decorah, Iowa	75	52	69
Macalester College	St. Paul, Minn.	75	53	71
Maryville College of the Sacred Heart	St. Louis, Mo.	100	74	74
Missouri, University of	Columbia, Mo.	100	51	51
Nebraska State Teachers College	Wayne, Neb.	76	47	62
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College	Kirksville, Mo.	100	49	49
Northwest Missouri State College	Maryville, Mo.	75	43	57

Name of college or university	Location	Number mailed questionnaires	Number returning questionnaires	Response rate (%)
St. Scholastica, College of	Duluth, Minn.	75	61	81
South Dakota, State University of	Vermillion, S.D.	100	52	52
Yankton College	Yankton, S.D.	100	50	50
South West Central States				
Centenary College	Shreveport, La.	100	44	44
Hendrix College	Conway, Ark.	75	50	67
Phillips University	Enid, Okla.	100	56	56
Southwestern University	Georgetown, Texas	100	59	59
Texas, University of	Austin, Texas	100	46	46
Texas Christian University	Fort Worth, Texas	100	52	52
Trinity University	San Antonio, Texas	100	58	58
Mountain States				
Brigham Young University	Provo, Utah	75	48	64
Colorado School of Mines	Golden, Colo.	100	48	48
Montana State University	Missoula, Mont.	100	54	54
Pacific States				
California, University of, Santa Barbara	Goleta, Calif.	100	54	54
Oregon, University of	Eugene, Ore.	100	60	60
Oregon College of Education	Monmouth, Ore.	100	57	57
Portland, University of	Portland, Ore.	100	50	50
Reed College	Portland, Ore.	100	66	66
Stanford University	Stanford, Calif.	100	74	74
Upland College	Upland, Calif.	100	43	43
Western Washington State College	Bellingham, Wash.	100	57	57

Appendix F

QUESTIONNAIRE TO DEANS AND STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS

This questionnaire is part of a study, supported by the U. S. Office of Education, concerning the handling of student disciplinary problems in American colleges and universities.

The questions are arranged in five sections:

(1) Characteristics of your college and its student body
(2) General problems of student discipline
(3) Academic dishonesty (e.g., cheating and plagiarism)
(4) Judiciary bodies on which students serve (if you have any)
(5) The honor system (if you have one)

The questionnaire will take from 30 to 45 minutes to complete, depending on how many sections apply to your college. We ask you to take this time because we feel this problem is important. As college attendance rises and pressures for academic success become greater, our colleges will face more problems in maintaining adequate standards of conduct. Yet very little is known about the magnitude and sources of student disciplinary problems, or the effectiveness of various ways of handling them.

You may be very frank in your answers, for as soon as your questionnaire is coded, your name and the name of your school will be detached, and no mention of you or your school will appear in the report of findings. The information you give will be kept in the strictest confidence.

This questionnaire is the first stage of a two-year study. If you feel, after answering it, that your college might be interested in a further study of student disciplinary problems, please indicate in the last question the extent to which you might be willing to participate.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Allen H. Barton,
Director of Research

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR COLLEGE AND ITS STUDENT BODY

(This section is to be filled out by all respondents) 1-5:

1. a. Your name ____________ Title or Office ____________

b. Name of your college ____________

Location: City ____________ State ____________

NOTE: **Please answer the questionnaire in terms of the undergraduate student body which you represent or over which you have authority.**

2. Will you answer in terms of *(Check one)*: 6-

The entire undergraduate student body ☐ 0
Men's division only ☐ 1
Women's division only ☐ 2
Some other part of the student body ☐ 3
(Please specify what part) ____________
____

3. Which of the following student activities exist on your campus? *(Check as many as apply)* 7-

Intercollegiate or varsity athletics ☐ 0
Organized intramural athletics ☐ 1
Campus newspaper ☐ 2
All-campus social events ☐ 3
Freshman hazing, beanie wearing, etc. ☐ 4
Campus political parties ☐ 5
Student political groups (e.g., Young Republicans, etc.) ☐ 6
Student clubs in major subjects (e.g., History Club, etc.) ☐ 7

4. Which of the following academic arrangements exist on your campus? *(Check as many as apply)* 8-

Honor Roll or Dean's List ☐ 0
Honors or independent study program for advanced students ☐ 1
Research thesis required of all seniors ☐ 2
Comprehensive or qualifying exams in major fields ☐ 3
Program of exemption from courses by examination ☐ 4
At least 15 hours of core courses required of all freshmen ☐ 5
Tutorial system ☐ 6
Dormitories assigned by major subject ☐ 7
Cooperative work-study program ☐ 8
Quarter rather than semester system ☐ 9

5. Is there any form of student government on your campus? Yes ☐ No ☐ x 9-

If no, skip to question 9.

6. How much authority does each exercise?

(Check one on each line)	*Much authority*	*Some authority*	*Little authority*	*Does not exist*	
All campus student governing body	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	10-
Men's and women's coordinated groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	11-
Residence hall council(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Interfraternity or panhellenic council	☐	☐	☐	☐	13-
Class government	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	14-
College or division government (where several divisions are organized into a university)	☐	☐	☐	☐	15-
Honor or Key societies	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Other (Specify) ____________					

7. During the last few years, has the student government been active in: 17-

(Check one on each line)	*It now active*	*Has been active but is not now*	*Has not been active*	
Teaching or curriculum evaluation	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	18-
Chartering campus clubs and organizations	☐	☐	☐	19-
Organizing social events	☐	☐	☐	20-
Action programs in the local community	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	21-
Academic freedom for students	☐	☐	☐	22-
Inviting political speakers to the campus	☐	☐	☐	23-
Library policies	☐	☐	☐	24-
College admissions policies	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	25-
College scholarship policies	☐	☐	☐	26-
Freshman orientation	☐	☐	☐	27-

8. How much does the student government have of the following?

(Check one on each line)	*A great deal*	*Quite a bit*	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	*Very little*	
Faculty support and cooperation	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	28-
Administration support and cooperation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	29-
Regulation and control by administration	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	30-
Student support	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	31-
Prestige on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-

33/x

9. Estimate roughly the percentage of students at your college who:

Are female . . . . ______%

Are Negro . . . . ______%

Are not liberal arts students . . . ______%

Are part time students . . . . . . ______%

Are members or pledges of fraternities and sororities . . . . . ______%

Live in fraternity and sorority houses . . . . ______%

Live in dormitories and residence halls . . . . ______%

Do not live within walking distance of campus . . . . ______%

Are on scholarship or get financial aid from the college . . . . ______%

Come from a Protestant religious background . . . . ______% 34-5:

Come from private high schools (prep or parochial) . . . . . ______% 36-7:

Come from within the state . . . ______% 38-9:

Come from a working class or lower class background . . . ______% 40-1:

Are admitted from among all those who apply . . . . ______% 42-3:

Fail to graduate from among all those who are admitted . . . ______% 44-5:

Go to graduate or professional schools from among all those who graduate . . . . ______% 46-7:

Are not adequately prepared for college work when they enter college . . . . ______% 48-9:

Voted in the last all-campus student election . . . . ______% 50-1:

10. **At many colleges the student body tends to be split into groups or functions along certain lines of cleavage. How significant are the following lines of cleavage among students on your campus?** **52/x**

(Check one on each line)	*Quite significant*	*Fairly significant*	*Not significant*	*Does not apply*	
1 - Intellectual vs. social	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	**53-**
2 - Liberal arts vs. applied subjects	☐	☐	☐	☐	**54-**
3 - Commuter vs. residential students	☐	☐	☐	☐	**55-**
4 - Fraternities (or sororities) vs. independents	☐	☐	☐	☐	**56-**
5 - Between groups of fraternities (or sororities)	☐	☐	☐	☐	**57-**
6 - Between residence halls	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	**58-**
7 - Between classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	**59-**
8 - Between well-to-do and poorer students	☐	☐	☐	☐	**60-**
9 - Between religious or ethnic groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	**61-**
10 - Between liberals and conservatives	☐	☐	☐	☐	**62-**

11 - Others (specify other noticeable cleavages on your campus) ______________________________ **63-**

______________________________ **64-**

11. **Which one cleavage of those listed in question 10 plays the greatest part in campus politics. Circle the number in front of the cleavage in the list above (items through 11).**

12. **Among the student body at your college, how much would you say there is of the following?**

(Check one on each line)	*A great deal*	*Quite a bit*	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	*Very little*	
Emphasis on social life	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	**65-**
Interest in ideas and intellectual problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**66-**
Emphasis on grades	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**67-**
Emphasis on athletics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**68-**
Participation in extra-curricular activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**69-**
Competition in class	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**70-**
Commitment to campus traditions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**71-**
Acceptance of campus rules and regulations	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	**72-**
Maturity and responsibility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**73-**
Freedom and privileges	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**74-**
Collegiate community spirit and identity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**75-**
Commitment to religion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**76-**
Participation in campus religious organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	**77-**

13. **About how many students are there:** **1-5:**

Write in the numbers

In the entire student body ______ **6-**

In the freshman class ______ **7-**

In the senior class ______ **8-**

In an average sized course ______ **9-**

Per teacher ______ **10-**

14. **How close are relationships on your campus between:**

(Check one on each line)	*Very close*	*Fairly close*	*Not very close*	*Not at all close*	
Students—faculty	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	11-
Students — faculty advisors	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Students—administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	13-
Students—student leaders	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	14-
Student leaders—administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	15-
Student leaders—faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Faculty—administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	17-

15. **How many teachers at your college:**

(Check one on each line)	*All or almost all*	*Most*	*About half*	*Few*	*None or nearly none*	
Take class attendance regularly	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	18-
Hold regular weekly office hours for students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19-
Mark on the "curve"	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
Take a personal interest in students	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	21-
Invite students to their homes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22-
Require a great deal of work from students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23-
Are enthusiastic about teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24-
						25/x

16. **How many cuts per three hour course are permitted:**

	Write in the number	
Students with average grades	________	26-
Students with high grades (Dean's List or Honor Roll)	________	27-

17. **Regarding tests and exams how often do the following occur?**

(Check one on each line)	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Occasionally*	*Never*	
a. Faculty proctor	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	28-
Students proctor	☐	☐	☐	☐	29-
No proctor is in the exam room	☐	☐	☐	☐	30-
Proctors watch students very closely	☐	☐	☐	☐	31-
b. Students may smoke	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
Students may leave their seats without special permission	☐	☐	☐	☐	33-
Students may leave the room without special permission	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
Students may take their exam papers out of the room	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	35-
Students may keep copies of the exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
c. Seating is staggered	☐	☐	☐	☐	37-
Students sit in assigned seats	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
Exams are given to more than one class at a time in large rooms	☐	☐	☐	☐	39-
The same exam is given to later classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	40-
The same exam has been given in previous years	☐	☐	☐	☐	41-

18. How often are the following types of exams and types of exam questions given? ***(Check one on each line)***

a. Types of exams	*Frequently*	*Occasionally*	*Rarely*	*Never*	
Open book	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	42-
Take home	☐	☐	☐	☐	43-
Unannounced tests or quizzes	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
Scheduled tests other than mid-terms or finals	☐	☐	☐	☐	45-
b. Types of exam questions					
True-false, multiple choice or matching	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	46-
Short written answer	☐	☐	☐	☐	47-
Essay	☐	☐	☐	☐	48-

19. Estimate roughly how much each of the following counts toward the final grade in most courses at your college?

	Write in the percentages	
The final exam	____%	49-
Other tests and exams	____%	50-
Papers and home work assignments	____%	51-
Classroom participation	____%	52-
Total	100%	

20. a. What kind of final grades are given? ***(Check as many as apply)*** 53-

Numerical grades ☐ 0
Letter grades ☐ 1
Pass or fail grades ☐ 2
Other: (specify) ____________

b. How are students notified of their marks? ***(Check as many as apply)*** 54- 55/x

Grades are posted by name ☐ 5
Grades are posted without names ☐ 6
Students are notified by mail ☐ 7
Students are notified by their instructors personally ☐ 8
Students are not told their grades for individual course ☐ 9
Other: (specify) ____________

II. GENERAL PROBLEMS OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE

(This section is to be filled out by all respondents.)

21. a. What group takes primary responsibility for informing students of campus rules and regulations? ***(Check one)*** 56-

Student government or student leaders ☐ 0
Faculty ☐ 1
Administration ☐ 2
Other: (specify) ____________

b. Which of the following arrangements exist for informing students about campus rules and regulations? ***(Check as many as apply)*** 57-

Pre-school orientation for freshmen ☐ 5
An orientation assembly at the beginning of the year for the whole freshman class ☐ 6
A series of orientation meetings during the school year for freshmen ☐ 7
Student handbook publishes rules and regulations ☐ 8
School newspaper publishes rules and regulations ☐ 9
Notices of rules and regulations posted on campus ☐ x

22. **Do the following activities violate any kind of rules or regulations on your campus?**

(Check the **first one which applies** *on each line)*	*Violates the honor system (if you have one)*	*Violates written rules or regulations*	*Violates unwritten rules of conduct*	*Violates no campus rules or regulation*	
Frequently cutting classes	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	58-
Frequently cutting chapel	☐	☐	☐	☐	59-
Using other students' work in preparing assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐	60-
Using copies of old exams in studying for exams	☐	☐	☐	☐	61-
Marking up library books	☐	☐	☐	☐	62-
Drinking alcoholic beverages on campus	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	63-
Gambling on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	64-
Wearing dungarees to class	☐	☐	☐	☐	65-
Having guests of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms past a certain hour	☐	☐	☐	☐	66-
Having guests of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms at all	☐	☐	☐	☐	67-
Failing to turn lights out in dormitory rooms at a certain hour	☐	☐	☐	☐	68-

23. **What individual or group on your campus usually decides upon disciplinary measures in cases of the following types?**

	One individual from the:			OR A group or committee composed of:				
(Check **one** *on each line)*	*Faculty*	*Administration*	*Student body*	*Mostly faculty*	*Mostly administration*	*Mostly students*	*Does not apply*	
Cheating or plagiarism	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	69-
Theft	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	70-
Destruction of property	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	71-
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	72-
Sex misconduct	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	73-
Misconduct regarding possession or use of alcoholic beverages	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	74-
Misconduct in relations between students and members of the local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	75-
Riots or mob action	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	76-
Breaking rules in the dormitory	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	77-

24. Below is a list of punishments or penalties which may be imposed in disciplinary cases. **1-5:**

1 - *Reprimand*
2 - *Fine or demerits*
3 - *Work assignment or making up time*
4 - *Restriction of privileges or campusing*
5 - *Doing paper or exam over*
6 - *Failing or losing credit for the paper or exam*
7 - *Failing or losing creidt for the course*
8 - *Short-term suspension (weeks)*
9 - *Long-term suspension (monthly)*
10 - *Dismissal (permanent)*
11 - *No penalty*
12 - *No rules apply*

From the list above, identify the penalty which comes **closest** to the one that is usually imposed for the following violations:

(Fill in a number for each)	*Number of usual penalty*	*If other penalties are often imposed in addition or as alternatives specify them below*	
Plagiarizing on a term paper			6-7:
Cheating on a mid-term exam			8-9:
Cheating on a final exam			10-1:
Giving answers to another student on a final exam			12-3:
Not reporting a student observed cheating on a final exam			14-5:
Marking up books in the library			16-7:
Stealing books from the library			18-9:
Stealing possessions or money from other students			20-1:
Being drunk and disorderly			22-3:
Violating rules regarding the possession and use of alcoholic beverages			24-5:
Violating rules about having guests of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms			26-7:

25. Since last September: **28/x**

a. About how many students have been brought to the attention of authorities for:

	Number of students	Would you say this number is: *More than usual*	*About the same as usual*	*Less than usual*	
Cheating and plagiarism		☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	29-30:
Theft		☐	☐	☐	31-2:
Destruction of property		☐	☐	☐	33-4:
Sex misconduct		☐	☐	☐	35-6:
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior		☐	☐	☐	37-8:
b. About how many students have been expelled or left school for disciplinary reasons (other than bad grades)?		☐	☐	☐	39-40:

26. Below is a list of three types of offenses or violations which may occur on your campus.

1 - *Cheating and plagiarism*
2 - *Personal, social and property offenses*
3 - *Breaking minor campus rules and regulations*

From the list above, identify the type of offense which you would say:

(Fill in a number for each)	*Number of type of offense*	
Is most often committed on your campus		41-
Is least often committed on your campus		42-
Poses the least serious problem of student discipline on your campus		43-
Poses the most serious problem of student discipline on your campus		44-

27 a. At your college how serious would you say disciplinary problems are in:

(Check one on each line)	*Major problem*	*Minor problem*	*No problem*	*Does not apply*	
The classroom ________	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	45-
The library ________	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
Dormitories and residence halls ________	☐	☐	☐	☐	47-
Fraternities and/or sororities ________	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	48-
Other places on campus ________	☐	☐	☐	☐	49-
Off campus places ________	☐	☐	☐	☐	50-

b. Mention what you consider the most serious problem of student discipline at your college in the space below. 51-

____ 52-

____

____

III. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (E.G., CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM) 53/x

(This section is to be filled out by all respondents)

28. On the basis of your experience on campus and the cases of cheating and plagiarism you are familiar with, give a rough estimate of the following percentages.

a. For the student body as a whole, estimate roughly what percentage:

Cheat or plagiarize and are discovered . ____% 54-
Cheat or plagiarize but are not discovered ____% 55-
Do not cheat or plagiarize . . . . . . ____% 56-
100%

b. Of those students who cheat or plagiarize and are discovered, estimate roughly what percentage:

Are discovered by faculty . . . . . . ____% 57-
Are reported by students . . . . ____% 58-
100%

c. Of those students brought to the attention of authorities for cheating or plagiarism, estimate roughly what percentage:

Admit guilt . . . . ____% 59-
Deny guilt but are found guilty . . . ____% 60-
Deny guilt and are found not guilty . . ____% 61-
100%

d. Of those students brought to the attention of faculty for cheating or plagiarism, estimate roughly what percentage of the cases:

Are handled by faculty . . . . ____% 62-
Are passed on to some other authority . ____% 63-
100%

29. a. Rank the following types of cheating in order of frequency with which you would say they are used by students at your college

Rank 1 for most often through 4 for least often

Using crib notes during an exam ________ ____ 64-
Copying from another student during an exam ________ ____ 65-
Plagiarizing from published material on papers ________ ____ 66-
Turning in papers done entirely or in part by other students ________ ____ 67-

b. Rank the following types of cheating in order of frequency with which you would say they are brought to the attention of authorities.

Rank 1 for most often through 4 for least often

Using crib notes on an exam ________ ____ 68-
Copying on an exam from another student ________ ____ 69-
Plagiarizing from published material on a paper ________ ____ 70-
Turning in a paper done entirely or in part by another student ________ ____ 71-

30. What groups or kinds of students would you say cheat or plagiarize more often than others on your campus? 72- 73- 74- 75-

____

____

31. How often are the following procedures followed on your campus in cases of cheating and plagiarism? 1-5

(Check one on each line)	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Occasionally*	*Never*	
The accused may request a hearing or review of his case	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	6-
The accused has a formal hearing	☐	☐	☐	☐	7-
A witness is allowed to keep his identity secret from the accused	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
The accused is told that his punishment will be less severe if he admits to the violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	9-
Decisions are made public	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	10-
Records of cases and decisions are kept	☐	☐	☐	☐	11-
Records are kept of students under suspicion	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Students under suspicion are watched closely	☐	☐	☐	☐	13-

32. Circle the number of days that elapse on the average between the time a case of cheating or plagiarism is discovered and the time when disciplinary measures are finally decided upon?

1 2 3 4 5-7 8-10 11-14 15 or more 14-

33. In coming to a decision about disciplinary measures in cases of cheating and plagiarism, how much influence do the following usually have?

(Check one on each line)	*Much influence*	*Some influence*	*Little or no influence*	
Teacher in whose course the violation ocurred	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	15-
Faculty advisor to the offender	☐	☐	☐	16-
Other faculty members who know the offender	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	17-
Dean or someone from administration	☐	☐	☐	18-
Student leaders	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	19-
Other students who know the offender	☐	☐	☐	20-
Other: (specify)	☐	☐	☐	21-

34. How often do the following considerations affect the decision in case of cheating and plagiarism on your campus?

(Check one on each line)	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Occasionally*	*Never*	
Offender's motivation in the particular case	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	22-
Influence of other students on the offender	☐	☐	☐	☐	23-
Offender's grade average and academic standing	☐	☐	☐	☐	24-
Offender's classroom attitude	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	25-
Offender's attitude toward his violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	26-
Offender's background and upbringing	☐	☐	☐	☐	27-

35. In assigning punishments for cheating and plagiarism on your campus, how important is it that the punishment:

(Check one on each line)	*Very important*	*Fairly important*	*Not important*	
Conform to precedent	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	28-
Fit the circumstances of the particular case	☐	☐	☐	29-
Be just in the eyes of the faculty and administration	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	30-
Be just in the eyes of the student body	☐	☐	☐	31-
Help the offender to understand his mistake	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	32-
Prevent the offender from repeating his violation	☐	☐	☐	33-
Prevent others from committing the same violation	☐	☐	☐	34-

36. Compared to other colleges across the country would you say the amount of cheating and plagiarism at your college is *(Check one)*: 35-

Quite a bit higher than average	☐ 0	Somewhat lower than average	☐ 3	
Somewhat higher than average	☐ 1	Quite a bit lower than average	☐ 4	36/x
About average	☐ 2			

IV. JUDICIARY BODIES ON WHICH STUDENTS SERVE

37. Do students serve on any committees or courts which hear violations of campus rules and regulations?

Yes ☐ No ☐ 0

If no, skip to question 50, page 12. 37-

38. Indicate all judiciary bodies on which students serve that exist on your campus. 38-

(Check as many as apply)		*Specify all other judiciary bodies on which students serve at your college*	
1 - Student-faculty or administration committee	☐	6 -	39-
2 - All student court or council with campus-wide jurisdiction	☐	7 -	
3 - Men's court	☐	8 -	
4 - Women's court	☐	9 -	
5 - Residence hall judiciaries	☐	10 -	

NOTE: The remaining questions in this section are to be answered in terms of one of the judiciary bodies you have checked or specified in the question above. Answer for the judiciary body which hears cases of cheating or plagiarism if students serve on such a body. If not, answer for the judiciary body with highest authority on which students serve.

39. Circle the number in front of the judiciary body in question 38 in terms of which you will be answering. 40-

40. Does this judiciary body: 41-

	Check as many as apply
Hear cases of cheating or plagiarism	☐ 0
Hear all violations of the honor system (if you have one)	☐ 1
Hear some violations of the honor system (if you have one)	☐ 2
Have highest authority among judiciary bodies on which students serve	☐ 3

41. a. How many members does this judiciary body have? (Total number) ________ 42-

b. How many from: Faculty ________ Administration ________ Student body ________ 43- 44- 45-

42. Which of the following groups selects one or more student representatives on this judiciary body? *(Check as many as apply)* 46-

Student body as a whole	☐ 1	Administration	☐ 5
Each class of the student body	☐ 2	Dormitories and residence halls	☐ 6
Student governing body	☐ 3	Interfraternity or panhellenic council	☐ 7
Faculty	☐ 4	Other (specify) ________	

43. Does this judiciary body have *(Check as many as apply)*: 47-

A student chairman	☐ 0	Advisors from other student government group	☐ 4
A student secretary	☐ 1	Members who also serve on other student government groups	☐ 5
Advisors from faculty	☐ 2	Members whose term of office is longer than one school year	☐ 6
Advisors from administration	☐ 3		

44. This judiciary body:

Check one

Is the same as the student government executive body ☐ 0 — 48-
Includes no member of the student government executive body ☐ 1
Has some members in common with the student government executive body ☐ 2
If so, how many? *(Write in the number)* ______ — 49-

45. This judiciary body has power of review over *(Check as many as apply)*: — 50-

Decisions from lower judiciary bodies ☐ 0
Student government executive action ☐ 1
Student government legislative action ☐ 2
Decisions of the interfraternity or panhellenic council ☐ 3
Campus election returns ☐ 4
Policies of campus publications ☐ 5

46. Can this judiciary body impose or recommend *(Check as many as apply)*: — 51-

Fines ☐ 0
Demerits ☐ 1
Social probation ☐ 2
Academic probation ☐ 3
Suspension from school ☐ 4
Expulsion from school ☐ 5

47. a. In the following types of cases, how often are the decisions of this judiciary body reviewed by a higher authority?

(Check one on each line)	ARE REVIEWED:					
	Always	*Frequently*	*Occasionally*	*Never*	*Does not handle such cases*	
Cheating and plagiarism	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	52-
Personal, social and property offenses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	53-
Breaking minor rules and regulations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	54-

b. When judiciary body decisions are reviewed by a higher authority, how frequently are they modified or changed?

(Check one on each line)	DECISIONS ARE MODIFIED:					
	Frequently	*Occasionally*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*Does not apply*	
Cheating and plagiarism	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	55-
Personal, social, and property offenses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	56-
Breaking minor rules and regulations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	57-

48. How much does this judiciary body have of the following?

(Check one on each line)	*A great deal*	*Quite a bit*	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	*Very little*	
Faculty support and cooperation	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	58-
Administration support and cooperation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	59-
Regulation and control by administration	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	60-
Student support	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	61-
Prestige on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	62-

49. Do any groups of students oppose the operations of this judiciary body?

Yes ☐ 0 No ☐ 1

If yes, please specify what groups ________________________________

____

63-
64-
65-
66-
67/x

V. THE HONOR SYSTEM

50. Is there an honor system at your college? Yes ☐ No ☐ 0 68-

If no, skip to question 60, on page 14.

51. Does the honor system apply to *(Check one)*:

The entire student body	☐ 1	Some other part of the student body	
Men's division only	☐ 2	(Please specify what part) ______	69-
Women's division only	☐ 3	______	

52. Does the honor system apply to behavior in *(Check as many as apply)*:

The classroom	☐ 0	Fraternities and/or sororities	☐ 3	
The library	☐ 1	Other places on campus	☐ 4	70-
Dormitories and residence halls	☐ 2	Off campus places	☐ 5	

53. Regarding the honor system, on each of the following scales check one of the boxes between the extremes. (For **very close** to either extreme check the first or last box, for **fairly close** check the second or fourth box, and for **in between** check the middle box.)

a. The interpretation of the honor code or principle:

	1	2	3	4	5		
is vague and indefinite	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	is clear and definite	71-
is inflexible	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	is flexible	72-
varies from year to year	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	remains constant	73-

b. Student commitment to the honor code or principle:

	1	2	3	4	5		
is weak	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	is strong	74-
is stronger among freshmen and sophomores	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	is stronger among juniors and seniors	75-
was stronger a few years ago	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	is stronger now	76-

c. Penalties under the honor system:

	1	2	3	4	5		
are lenient	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	are severe	77-
are fixed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	are variable	78-
are intended primarily as punishment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	are intended primarily to rehabilitate the offender	79-

54. Is there an honor pledge? Yes ☐ No ☐ 0 1-5:

If yes, which of the following statements are true of the **honor pledge**? 6-

	Check as many as apply
Students must pledge orally or in writing to abide by the honor system	☐ 1
Such a pledge is voluntary	☐ 2
Students must sign a pledge that they have neither given nor received aid on exams	☐ 3
Students must sign such a pledge on term papers or home work assignments	☐ 4

55. Does your honor system require or recommend that a:

(Check one on each line)	*Requires*	*Recommends*	*Does not require or recommend*	
Student who has committed a violation report himself	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	7-
Student who has witnessed a violation report the offender	☐	☐	☐	8-
Witness to a violation ask the offender to report himself	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	9-
Witness report the offender if he fails to report himself after being asked to do so	☐	☐	☐	10-
Student who is suspicious but not certain of a violation report his suspicion	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	11-
Witness who fails to report a violation be reported	☐	☐	☐	12-

56. How likely are students to report others for honor violations in cases of the following types?

(Check one on each line)	*Very likely*	*Fairly likely*	*Not very likely*	*The honor system does not apply*	
Cheating on exams	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	13-
Plagiarism	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Theft	☐	☐	☐	☐	15-
Destruction of property	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Drunkenness, disorderly conduct, or improper social behavior	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	17-
Sex misconduct	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
Misconduct regarding the possession or use of alcoholic beverages	☐	☐	☐	☐	19-
Misconduct in relations between students and members of the local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
Riots or mob action	☐	☐	☐	☐	21-

57. How many students on your campus do you think would:

(Check one on each line)	*All or almost all*	*Many*	*About half*	*Few*	*None or nearly none*	
Express their disapproval informally to an offender rather than report him for an honor violation	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	22-
Report only honor violations of students they dislike personally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23-
Report honor violations of their friends	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	24-
Report no kind of honor violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	25-
Report every kind of honor violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26-

58. About how many students have been brought to the attention of authorities since last September for:

		Would you say this number is:			
	Number of students	*More than usual*	*About the same as usual*	*Less than usual*	
Serious honor violations	______	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	27-8:
Not serious honor violation	______	☐	☐	☐	29-30:

59. How serious are the following as problems now facing your honor system?

(Check one on each line)	*Quite serious*	*Fairly serious*	*Not serious*	
Maintaining student support for the honor system	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2	31-
Getting more compliance with specific rules	☐	☐	☐	32-
Motivating students to report violations	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	33-
Getting more cooperation and support from the faculty	☐	☐	☐	34-
Getting more cooperation and support from administration	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ x	35-
Achieving more independent student control	☐	☐	☐	36-

CONCLUDING INFORMATION

60. What are your college's plans regarding:

(Check **one** *on each line)*	If you have one, do you plan			OR	If you do not have one, do you plan			
	To keep it	*To give it up next year*	*To give it up in a few years*		*Not to have one*	*To have one next year*	*To have one in a few years*	
An honor system	☐ 0	☐ 1	☐ 2		☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	37-
A judiciary body on which students serve that hears cases of cheating or plagiarism	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	38-

61. About fifty colleges will be selected for a more intense analysis of student disciplinary problems on their campuses in the second phase of this study. Naturally, the findings from this phase will be made available to each of the participating colleges in return for their cooperation.

a. Do you think your college would be interested in participating in the second phase of this study?

	Check one	
Yes	☐ 0	
No	☐ 1	39-
Not sure	☐ 2	

b. How many questionnaires could you distribute or arrange to distribute on your campus?

	Check one	
About 50 to students selected from the student directory	☐ 4	
About 150 to students in classrooms	☐ 5	
About 350 to students in classrooms	☐ 6	40-
To the entire student body	☐ 7	
To none	☐ 8	

Thank you again for your cooperation. We invite you to add any comments about student disciplinary problems you may wish to make. Please use the remaining space for your comments. Feel free to append additional sheets of paper if your comments become too lengthy for inclusion in the remaining space.

Appendix G

QUESTIONNAIRE TO STUDENTS

Dear Student:

This questionnaire is part of a study, sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education, concerning problems of student discipline in American colleges and universities. The questionnaire focuses on pressures toward misconduct among college students.

Your college was chosen for this study, with about fifty other colleges, on the basis of the responses of your Dean and Student Body President to an earlier questionnaire concerning the handling of student disciplinary problems on your campus.

You and seventy-five other students were selected randomly from a list of all the students at your college to represent your school in our sample.

Please *do not sign your name* to the questionnaire. We want you to feel free to answer the questions truthfully and to the best of your own personal knowledge. Only those schools where the Dean has agreed with us that the answers of individual students will remain completely anonymous have been permitted to participate in this study. I can assure you that no one on your campus will learn what answers you gave, or, for that matter, which students on your campus filled out the questionnaire.

Virtually all the students sampled must return their questionnaires for your college to be adequately represented in our study; therefore, it is important that you complete and return your questionnaire to us as soon as possible. You will be assisting in valuable research; and I believe you will find that filling out the questionnaire is interesting and provocative, as did the students who helped us design it.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Allen H. Barton,
Director

I. YOUR INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES IN COLLEGE 1–5:

1. a. Write in the name of your college or university____________________________

b. Check your present academic class.

Freshman ☐ 1 Sophomore ☐ 2 Junior ☐ 3 Senior ☐ 4 Other ☐ 5 6-

2. Have you transferred from some other college? Yes ☐ No ☐ 1 7-

If yes, did you enter **this** college as a:

Freshman ☐ 2 Sophomore ☐ 3 Junior ☐ 4 Senior ☐ 5 Other ☐ 6

3. In what major or field of concentration do you expect to graduate?____________________ 8-

4. a. Rank the following groups or individuals in order of importance in helping you decide what subject to major in. (Place a "1" next to the most important, a "2" next to the second most important, etc.) 9-

Your parents . . . . ______ 10-
Your college teachers . . ______ 11-
Your college friends . . ______ 12-

b. Anyone else? (specify)____ 13-

5. Do you plan to take further training after college? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 Undecided ☐ 3 14-

If yes or undecided, do you think you will go to:

Graduate school ☐ 1 Business or professional school ☐ 2 Other ☐ 3 15-

6. What kind of occupation do you plan to go into? (Be as specific as you can about position, type of work—e.g., 16-
claims adjustor for an insurance company, teacher in local high school.)____________________ 17-

7. How certain is your choice of occupation?

Very certain ☐ 1 Fairly certain ☐ 2 Not very certain ☐ 3 Not at all certain ☐ 4 18-

8. Rank the following three items in order of their importance to you.

Groups and activities outside college. ________ 19-
College social life and activities ..... ________ 20-
Studies and academic work......... ________ 21-

9. College students have different ideas about the main purpose of a college education. Statements of some purposes are listed below. As you read this list, indicate how important each of these purposes is to you.

	Very important	*Fairly important*	*Not very important*	
a. Provide vocational training; develop skills and techniques directly applicable to my career_____	☐	☐	☐	22-
b. Develop my ability to get along with different kinds of people_____	☐	☐	☐	23-
c. Provide a basic general education and appreciation of ideas_____	☐	☐	☐	24-
d. Develop my knowledge and interest in community and world problems_____	☐	☐	☐	25-
e. Help develop my moral capacities, ethical standards and values_____	☐	☐	☐	26-
f. Prepare me for a happy marriage and family life_____	☐	☐	☐	27-
	1	2	3	

10. Now go back and circle the letter of the purpose you consider most important in the list above. 28-

11. How important is it 1) to your parents, 2) to yourself, that you:

(Check one on each line)		*Extremely important*	*Quite important*	*Fairly important*	*Not very important*	
a. Graduate from college	1) to your parents_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	29-
	2) to yourself_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	30-
b. Graduate from **this** college	1) to your parents_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	31-
	2) to yourself_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
c. Get good grades in college	1) to your parents_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	33-
	2) to yourself_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
d. Get ahead in life	1) to your parents_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	35-
	2) to yourself_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
		1	2	3	4	

12. How well satisfied are you with your educational experience at this college?

Very well satisfied ☐ 1 Fairly well satisfied ☐ 2 Not very well satisfied ☐ 3 Not at all satisfied ☐ 4 37-

13. Do you have a job during the academic year? Yes ☐ No ☐ 1

If yes, circle the number of hours you work per week. 38-

6 or less	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-35	more than 36
(2)	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	*(7)*	*(8)*

14. Do you have a fellowship, scholarship or other type of financial award? Yes ☐ No ☐ 1

If yes, 39-

a. Does it cover: *(Check one)*

Minor expenses___ ☐ 2
Part of the tuition ☐ 3
Full tuition_____ ☐ 4
Tuition and some other expenses ☐ 5
All or nearly all expenses_____ ☐ 6

b. Was it awarded primarily on the basis of: *(Check one)*

Financial need ☐ 1 Athletic ability ☐ 2 Academic achievement ☐ 3 40-

Other ☐ 4 (specify)____________________

15. How likely are you to have some kind of financial award next year?

Certain ☐ 1 Likely ☐ 2 Not likely ☐ 3 Not sure ☐ 4 Does not apply ☐ 5 (e.g., seniors) 41-

16. While attending college, do you live in: *(Check one)* 42-

Parents' or relatives' home.. ☐ 1
Dormitory or residence hall ☐ 2
Fraternity or sorority h[illegible]
Co-op house_____ [illegible]
Off-campus room, apartment not under college control ☐ 5
Off-campus facilities under college control_____ ☐ 6
Other (specify)__________ ☐ 7

17. Do you live:

Alone.________________ ☐ 1 With spouse.________________ ☐ 4 43-
With a roommate.____________ ☐ 2 With parents or other relatives ☐ 5
With more than one roommate ☐ 3

18. Approximately how many students live in the same house, building, or hall as you?

*(Write in the approximate number)*________ 44-

19. Are you: Single ☐ Married ☐ 1 Other (divorced, widowed) ☐ 2 46-

If **single**, are you:

Unattached ☐ 3 Pinned or dating one person consistently ☐ 4 Engaged ☐ 5

20. If **single**, how often, on the average, did you date during this last year at college?

a. Prearranged evening meetings with the opposite sex:

b. Spur of the moment get togethers with the opposite sex:

(Check one)		*(Check one)*	
☐ 1	Not at all	☐ 1	47-
☐ 2	Once a month or less	☐ 2	48-
☐ 3	Two or three times a month	☐ 3	
☐ 4	Once or twice a week	☐ 4	
☐ 5	More than that	☐ 5	

21. Approximately what percent of your dates were from the following groups?

(Write in the percentage)

Students at your college.......... ______% 49-
Students at other colleges......... ______% 51-
Persons other than college students ______% 53-
100%

22. Below is a list of campus groups and organizations.

1. Campus religious groups
2. Departmental or pre-professional clubs
3. Literary or cultural societies
4. Musical or theatrical groups
5. Publications (college newspaper, humor magazine, etc.)
6. Political or public affairs groups
7. Honor or key society 55-
8. Intramural athletics 57-
9. Intercollegiate athletics 59-
10. Student government 61-
11. Special interest groups (e.g., hiking club, photography club) 63-
12. Other (specify)________________ 65-
13. Other (specify)________________ 67-

a. Circle the number in front of any group or organization of which you have been a member while at this college. (If you belong to groups or organizations which are not included on the lists, specify what they are in "Other" above.)

b. If you have held an office or position of authority in the groups you have circled, designate the number of each group and the office or position you have held in it.________________________________

____

c. If you have been a member of an intercollegiate athletic team, write in the name of each sport in which you've participated.________________________________ 68-

23. During an average week at school (excluding weekend activities), approximately how many hours do you spend on each of the following activities:

Attending class and labs, etc.................. ________hours/week 69-
Studying and doing assignments............... ________hours/week 71-
Having informal discussions or "bull sessions" with fellow students...................... ________hours/week 73-
Watching T.V. or playing cards.............. ________hours/week 75-
Having a few drinks with other students...... ________hours/week 77-
Taking part in campus organizations and activities.................................. ________hours/week 79-

II. CAMPUS FRIENDS AND SOCIAL CLIMATE

24. We would like to ask you some questions about the **five** students at your college with whom you are most friendly. In order to fix the identity of each in your mind, please place the first name of your best friend in column "A", of your second best friend in column "B", and so on.
(Check **at least one** *on each line)*

	Applies to none of the friends listed	FRIENDS' FIRST NAMES A *Friend's name* ……………	B *Friend's name* ……………	C *Friend's name* ……………	D *Friend's name* ……………	E *Friend's name* ……………	1-5:
a. Check those friends who:							
Are a year or more ahead of you in college	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6-
Are a year or more behind you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
Are members of the opposite sex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10-
Live in the same building, house or hall as you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Are roommates of yours now	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Are members or pledges of a fraternity or sorority	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Are members or pledges of the same fraternity or sorority as you (if you are affiliated)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
Have the same major subject or field of concentration as you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
You knew personally before coming to college	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22-
You consider close personal friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
b. Check those friends with whom you have had serious discussions about:							
Studies and academic matters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26-
Plans for occupation or career	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	28-
Political or social issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	30-
Values, morals, or philosophy of life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
Social life, parties, or dating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Check those friends who have substantially influenced your ideas and thinking about:							
The goals of college education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
Plans for future occupation or career	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
Political or social issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	40-
Morals, values, or philosophy of life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	42-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Check those friends who have expressed disapproval about:							
Your behavior at parties	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
Your grades	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
The amount of time you spend studying	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	48-
Your degree of participation in extra-curricular activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	50-
Your attitude toward your courses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	52-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

25. Are any of your five closest friends (listed above) also close friends of each other?
Circle those pairs who are close friends.

A-B	A-C	A-D	A-E	B-C	B-D	B-E	C-D	C-E	D-E	54-
(0)	*(1)*	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	*(7)*	*(8)*	*(9)*	55-

Most college students find other students with whom they are compatible—the group of students they go around with. We would like to ask you about the group of students you go around with at your college.

26. How well do the following characterize the group of students you go around with on your campus?

(Check one on each line)	*Very well*	*Fairly well*	*Not well*	*Not at all*	
We form a tight knit cohesive group	☐	☐	☐	☐	56-
We are recognized as a group by other students on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	57-
We do few things as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	58-
We are non-conventional	☐	☐	☐	☐	59-
We are easygoing and carefree	☐	☐	☐	☐	60-
We are concerned with maintaining standards of conduct on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	61-
We stir up excitement	☐	☐	☐	☐	62-
We enjoy drinking and partying	☐	☐	☐	☐	63-
	1	2	3	4	

27. Compared to the students you go around with:

	More than the students I go around with	*The same as the students I go around with*	*Less than the the students I go around with*	
Do you enjoy your studies?_____	☐	☐	☐	64-
How much time do you spend on your studies?_____	☐	☐	☐	65-
How much time do you spend alone?_____	☐	☐	☐	66-
Do fellow students ask you for your advice on personal matters?_____	☐	☐	☐	67-
Do fellow students ask you for your opinions on academic matters?_____	☐	☐	☐	68-
How intelligent or smart do you feel you are?_____	☐	☐	☐	69-
	1	2	3	

28. Are there social fraternities or sororities at your college? Yes ☐ No ☐ 1

If no, skip to question #36, page 6. 70-

29. Are you or have you been affiliated with a social fraternity or sorority at this college?

No._____	☐ 2
Yes, I am now a member_____	☐ 3
Yes, I am now a pledge_____	☐ 4
Yes, I was a member but am not now affiliated_____	☐ 5
Yes, I was a pledge but am not now affiliated_____	☐ 6

If no, skip to question #35, page 6.

30. Approximately how many members and pledges are there in your fraternity or sorority? 71-

*(Write in the approximate number.)*_____

31. Have you ever held any office or position in your house? Yes ☐ No ☐ 1 74-

If yes, specify which one(s)_____ _____

32. Compared to other fraternities or sororities on your campus:

	More than others	*About the same as others*	*Less than others*	
How selective is your house in choosing new members?_____	☐	☐	☐	75-
How much hazing of pledges is there?_____	☐	☐	☐	76-
How much emphasis is there on getting good grades?_____	☐	☐	☐	77
How much emphasis is there on participating in extra-curricular activities?_____	☐	☐	☐	78-
How much do the members associate with students outside your house?_____	☐	☐	☐	79-
	1	2	3	

1-5:

33. Does your house have:

	Yes	*No*	
Rushing of freshmen_____	☐	☐	6-
The one black ball system for excluding someone from membership_____	☐	☐	7-
Paddling or other physical hazing of pledges_____	☐	☐	8-
Required meetings of members at least once a month_____	☐	☐	9-
Planned social events of some kind at least once a month_____	☐	☐	10-
Files of old tests and exams_____	☐	☐	11-
	1	2	

34. How well would you say the following images of fraternities and sororities fit your house?

	Very well	*Fairly well*	*Not very well*	*Not at all*	
Athletic house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Intellectual house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	13-
Social or party house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Wealthy house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	15-
Cohesive, tight-knit house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Well-rounded house_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	17-
Best house on campus_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
	1	2	3	4	

35. If you had to do it over again, would you: *(Check only one)*

For independents:
Join a fraternity or sorority________ ☐ 1
Go independent________ ☐ 2
Not sure________ ☐ 3

For fraternity or sorority members:
Join the same house________ ☐ 4
Join some other house________ ☐ 5
Go independent________ ☐ 6
Not sure________ ☐ 7

19-

36. Which of the following groups gives a student the most prestige on your campus? (If a group does not exist on your campus, cross it off the last and rank the remaining groups.)

Student government…….	______	20-
A varsity athletic team….	______	21-
Social fraternity or sorority	______	22-
Dean's list or honor roll …	______	23-
Dorm counselor………..	______	24-

37. Among the student body at your college, how much would you say there is of the following?

	A great deal	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	
Emphasis on grades________	☐	☐	☐	25-
Competition in class________	☐	☐	☐	26-
Commitment to campus traditions________	☐	☐	☐	27-
Collegiate community spirit and identity________	☐	☐	☐	28-
Acceptance of campus rules and regulations________	☐	☐	☐	29-
Freedom and privileges________	☐	☐	☐	30-
	1	2	3	

38. How much does the student government have of the following?

	A great deal	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	
Faculty support and cooperation________	☐	☐	☐	31-
Administration support and cooperation________	☐	☐	☐	32-
Regulation and control by administration________	☐	☐	☐	33-
Student support________	☐	☐	☐	34-
Prestige on campus________	☐	☐	☐	35-
	1	2	3	

39. How much does each of the following contribute to a student's standing 1) among the student body as a whole, 2) among the students you go around with, and 3) in your own eyes?

(Check one on each line)		*A great deal*	*A fair amount*	*Not much*	*Not at all*	
a. Participation in campus activities	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	37-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
b. Active social life—lots of dates	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	39-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	40-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	41-
c. Good personality—"fun to be with"	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	42-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	43-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
d. Moral character	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	45-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	47-
e. Athletic skill	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	48-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	49-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	50-
f. Good grades	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	51-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	52-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	53-
g. Interest in ideas and intellectual problems	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	54-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	55-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	56-
h. Appreciation of the arts	1) among the student body as a whole________	☐	☐	☐	☐	57-
	2) among the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	58-
	3) in your own eyes________	☐	☐	☐	☐	59-
		1	2	3	4	

III. COURSES, INSTRUCTORS, AND EXAMS.

40. Write in the number of courses you took **last term**________.

Now we would like to ask you some questions about them. In order to keep them straight, list the title (e.g., Biology 11, Psychology 210) of the course you liked best under "A", the course you liked second best under "B", and so on. If you took more than five, list the five courses you remember best; if five or fewer, list them all.

	Applies to none of the courses listed	COURSE TITLE A *Course*	 B *Course*	 C *Course*	 D *Course*	 E *Course*	
a. Check those courses which:							
Were introductory rather than advanced______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	60-
Were seminar or discussion rather than lecture classes ______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	62-
Used outside readings more than textbooks______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	64-
Had more than 30 students in class______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	66-
Had less than 20 students in class______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	68-
Required no final exam______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	70-
Required both a term paper and a final exam______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	72-
Were personally very interesting______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	74-
Were definitely useful for future occupation or career______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	76-
Were concerned with important intellectual problems______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	78-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
b. Check those courses in which the instructor:							1-5:
Took class attendance regularly______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6-
Held weekly office hours for students______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
Marked on the "curve"______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10-
Was deeply interested in the subject he taught______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Took a personal interest in students______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Required a heavy work-load______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Really got across what he had to say______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
Stimulated your interest in the subject matter of the course______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
Influenced your thinking about the goals of college education______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22-
Influenced your plans for a future occupation or career______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Check those courses in which you:							
Sat toward the front of the classroom______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26-
Had informal talks with the instructor outside of the classroom or regular office hours______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	28-
Completed all the regular homework or lab assignments______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	30-
Stayed up to date in your reading and preparation for class______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
Always had enough time to finish tests and exams	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
Were sure of your final grade by midterm______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
Thought the grade you got was worse than you deserved______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
Thought the grade you got was better than you deserved______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	40-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Check those courses in which the following types of tests or exams were given:							
Open book______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	42-
Take home______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
Unannounced tests or quizzes______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
Three or more scheduled tests other than finals______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	48-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
e. Check those courses in which the following types of questions were asked on tests or exams:							
True-false, multiple-choice, or matching______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	50-
Short written answer or problem solving______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	52-
Essay______	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	54-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Fold back along dotted line and continue.

f. Check those courses in which the following occurred during tests or exams:

Seating was staggered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	56-
Students sat in assigned seats	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	58-
Students were allowed to leave their seats without special permission	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	60-
Students were allowed to leave the room without special permission	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	62-
Students were watched closely	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	64-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

g. Check those courses in which:

The same test or exam was given over again to later classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	66-
The same test or exam had been given in previous years	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	68-
Copies of past tests were routinely available in studying for exams	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	70-
Tests or exams were given to more than one class at a time in large rooms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	72-
The final exam determined more than a third of the final grade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	74-
Tests and exams other than the final determined more than a third of the final grade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	76-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

h. In preparing *for* tests and exams, check those courses in which you did the following:

							1-5:
Joined in a study group with other students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6-
Relied on last minute studying or cramming almost entirely	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
Used notes of students taking the course with you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10-
Used notes of students who had previously taken the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Used copies of old tests and exams in the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Spent more time in preparation than most other students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Felt anxious and nervous about how well you would do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

i. Check those courses in which you personally know about or learned about:

Any other students cheating on the final exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
Any other students cheating on tests other than the final	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22-
Any other students cheating on homework or lab assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24-
At least half the other students cheating at one or another time during the course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26-
	0	1	2	3	4	5	

j. For each course write in:

The number of hours or points of credit	____	____	____	____	____	28-
The grade you got	____	____	____	____	____	33-

k. Were any of your five closest friends in your class in each course?

	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	38-
	No ☐1	No ☐1	No ☐1	No ☐1	No ☐1	40-
If **yes**, circle the letter of the friend(s). (Refer back to question #24 for the letter of each friend.)	A B	A B	A B	A B	A B	42-
	C	C	C	C	C	44-
	D E	D E	D E	D E	D E	46-

41. Rank the following items in their order of importance to you in studying for tests and exams in most of your courses.

Notes on lectures and classroom discussion .... ______ 48-
The textbook .... ______ 49-
Outside readings and assignments .... ______ 50-
What has been asked on tests and exams in the course in previous years .... ______ 51-

42. Rank the following in order of importance for doing well on tests and exams in most of your courses.

Memory .... ______ 52-
Logical methodical thinking .... ______ 53-
Creativeness and a talent for expressing one's ideas .... ______ 54-
Diligence and preparation .... ______ 55-
Shrewdness in doping out what the teacher wants .... ______ 56-

43. Circle your grade average so far in college.

A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D or lower	57-
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	*(7)*	*(8)*	*(9)*	

IV. ACADEMIC DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

44. Since you have been in college have you seen another student cheating during a test or exam? 58-

Never ☐ 1 Once ☐ 2 A few times ☐ 3 Several times ☐ 4 Many times ☐ 5

45. a. Suppose you saw a student cheating. What would you do? *(Check one)* 59-

1. Report him to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority ______ ☐ 1
2. Ask him to report himself and report him if he fails to do so ______ ☐ 2
3. Express disapproval informally but not report him ______ ☐ 3
4. Mention the incident to other students but not report him ______ ☐ 4
5. Ignore the incident ______ ☐ 5

b. What would you do if the student you saw cheating were: *(Write in the number of the alternative from the list above)* 60-

A close friend______ A campus leader______ 61-

46. Suppose a student told you that he saw another student cheating during an exam and that he is unwilling to report the other student. What would you do about the student who saw the other cheating? *(Check one)* 62-

Report him for failing to report the other student ______ ☐ 1
Ask him to report the other student and report him if he fails to do so ______ ☐ 2
Express disapproval informally to him but not report him ______ ☐ 3
Ignore his remarks ______ ☐ 4
Agree with him that he should not report the other student ______ ☐ 5

47. Since you have been in college has another student indicated to you during a test or exam that he wanted help? 63-

Never ☐ 1 Once ☐ 2 A few times ☐ 3 Several times ☐ 4 Many times ☐ 5

48. a. If someone asked you for help during a test or exam, what would you do? *(Check one)* 64-

1. Give him the answer ______ ☐ 1
2. Say nothing but expose your paper so he can copy the answer ______ ☐ 2
3. Ignore or turn down his request ______ ☐ 3
4. Express disapproval informally but not report him ______ ☐ 4
5. Report him to the appropriate authorities ______ ☐ 5

b. What would you do if the student who asked you for help were: *(Write in the number of the alternative from the list above)* 65-

A campus leader ______ A close friend ______ Someone you disliked personally ______ 66- 67-

49. Since you have been at college have you **inadvertently** seen an answer on another student's paper during a test or exam?

Never ☐ 1 Once ☐ 2 A few times ☐ 3 Several times ☐ 4 Many times ☐ 5 68-

50. What would you do if you inadvertently saw the correct answer on another student's paper? *(Check one)* 69-

Write down the answer ☐ 1
Write down the answer but make a note that it came from another student's paper ☐ 2
Leave the question blank but make a note that the answer was seen on another student's paper ☐ 3
Leave the question blank without comment ☐ 4

51. If you had cheated in a course, would you tell:

(Check one on each line)	*I would not admit it*	*I would admit it but play it down*	*I would tell about it outright*	*I would exaggerate it*	
A close friend	☐	☐	☐	☐	70-
One of the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	71-
A faculty member	☐	☐	☐	☐	72-
Your parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	73-
	1	2	3	4	

52. If you had cheated in a course, and the following individuals told you they knew you had cheated, what would you feel?

	Shame	*Embarrassment*	*No reaction*	*Satisfaction*	
A close friend	☐	☐	☐	☐	74-
One of the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	75-
A faculty member	☐	☐	☐	☐	76-
Your parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	77-
	1	2	3	4	

53. If you had cheated in a course and the following individuals knew about it, how strongly would they disapprove?

	Very strongly	*Fairly strongly*	*Not very strongly*	*Not at all*	
A close friend	☐	☐	☐	☐	78-
One of the students you go around with	☐	☐	☐	☐	79-
A faculty member	☐	☐	☐	☐	80-
Your parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	1	2	3	4	

54. Which of the following disciplinary measures is most likely to be taken at your college when a student is caught cheating on:	**Mid-term exam**	**Final exam**	**Final exam for the second time**	1-5:
	(Check one)	*(Check one)*	*(Check one)*	6-
Reprimand the student and warn him not to do it again	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	
Make him do the exam over or take a make-up	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	9-
Make him fail the exam	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	
Make him fail the course	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	10-
Suspend him from school	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	
Expel him from school	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	11-

55. On the basis of your experience on campus and the cases of cheating and plagiarism you are familiar with, give a rough estimate of the following percentages.

a. For the student body as a whole, estimate roughly what percentage:

Have cheated since coming to college ______%
Have not cheated since coming to college ______%
100%

b. Of those students who cheat or plagiarize, estimate roughly what percentage: 12-

Cheat frequently ______%
Cheat occasionally ______% 14-
100%

c. Of those students who cheat or plagiarize, estimate roughly what percentage:

Are discovered ______%
Are not discovered ______%
100%

d. Of those students who cheat or plagiarize and are discovered, estimate roughly what percentage: 16-

Are discovered by the course instructor ______% 18-
Are reported by other students ______% 20-
Report themselves ______% 22-
100%

e. Of those students brought to the attention of faculty for cheating or plagiarism, estimate roughly in what percentage of the cases:

No disciplinary action is taken ______% 24-
Disciplinary action is taken by the course instructor ______% 26-
The case is passed on to some other authority for disciplinary action ______% 28-
100%

56. How did you learn about most of the cases of cheating and plagiarism you know about?:

	(Check one)	
Observing the instances yourself	☐ 1	30-
Hearing about them from the offenders	☐ 2	
Hearing about them from other students on the grapevine	☐ 3	
Hearing about them through official channels (e.g., the school newspaper, Dean's office, a faculty member, etc.)	☐ 4	

57. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(Check one on each line)

a. About cheating:	*Agree strongly*	*Agree mildly*	*Not sure*	*Disagree mildly*	*Disagree strongly*	
Under no circumstances is cheating justified	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	31-
Students are morally obligated not to cheat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
The individual's personal integrity or self-respect should be the basis for the decision not to cheat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	33-
Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
The student who starts cheating soon becomes lost in his course work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	35-
Cheating directly contradicts the goals of education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
	1	2	3	4	5	

b. About cheating at this college:						
Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	37-
Some faculty members condone cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	39-
Students try to avoid seeing others cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	40-
Students are suspicious of each other when it comes to cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	41-
Students know pretty clearly who would cheat and who would not	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	42-
Cheating is a serious problem on this campus	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	43-
	1	2	3	4	5	

58. Since you have been in college:

a. How often have the following things happened **that you know about?**

	Never	*Once*	*A few times*	*Several times*	*Many times*	
A student has reported himself for cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
One student has reported another for cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	45-
A student has been accused of cheating by mistake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
A student has been punished for cheating by mistake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	47-
An instructor has ignored an instance of cheating he knew about	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	48-
	1	2	3	4	5	

b. How often have **you:**

Worried about being accused of cheating when you were not guilty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	49-
Taken precautionary measures to insure that you would not be suspected of cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	50-
Been watched suspiciously by another student during an exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	51-
Used crib notes during an exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	52-
Copied from another student during an exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	53-
Plagiarized from published material on papers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	54-
Turned in papers done entirely or in part by other students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	55-
	1	2	3	4	5	

59. Check **all** the following which you have done at this college.

"Padding" a few items on a bibliography	☐ 1	56-
Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting in a paper	☐ 2	57-
Copying answers from a text or other source instead of doing the work independently	☐ 3	58-
Writing a paper for another student	☐ 4	59-
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam	☐ 1	60-
Giving answers to other students during an exam	☐ 2	61-
Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by use of signals	☐ 3	62-
Arranging to sit next to someone who will let you copy from him during a test or exam	☐ 4	63-
Copying from someone's test or exam paper without his knowing about it	☐ 5	64-
Copying from someone's test or exam paper with that person's knowledge	☐ 6	65-
Taking an exam for another student	☐ 7	66-
Having another student take an exam for you	☐ 8	67-
Working on the same homework with several students when the teacher does not allow it	☐ 9	68-

60. If you have cheated since coming to this college, please give the following information for each cheating incident up to three. (If you have cheated more than three times report only the last three; if three or fewer report them all; if not at all, skip to section #V, question #61, page 13.) A separate column is provided for each incident.

	Last incident	**Next to last incident**	**Incident before that**	
a. On what type of work did the incident occur?	*(Check one)*	*(Check one)*	*(Check one)*	
Final exam	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	69-
Midterm test or exam	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	
Test or quiz other than final or midterm	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	70-
Paper	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	
Lab work	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	71-
Other	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	
b. What method was used?	*(Check one)*	*(Check one)*	*(Check one)*	
Submitting published work as my own	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	72-
Submitting another student's work as my own	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	
Referring to notes during a test or exam	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	73-
Getting answers from another student	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	
Giving answers to another student	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	74-
Other	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 6	
c. Were any other students involved?	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	75-
If **yes,** circle the number:	1 2 3 4 5+	1 2 3 4 5+	1 2 3 4 5+	76- 77-
d. Do any of your five closest friends know that you cheated?	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	1-5: 6-
If **yes, which ones?** Circle the letter of your friend(s) that know you cheated. (For **friends,** refer back to question #24, section II, page 4.)	A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	7- 8-
e. Did any of your five closest friends actually participate in the incident by giving or receiving aid?	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	9- 10-
If **yes, which ones?** Circle the letter of the friend(s)	A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	11-
f. Did any of the cheating incidents occur last term? *(Check for each incident)*	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ No ☐ 0	12-
If **yes, in which course(s)?** (Circle the letter of the course from question #40, section III, page 7.)	A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	13- 14-

V. GENERAL DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

61. Here is a list of things students sometimes do in college. Would you indicate a.) whether you approve or disapprove of each, and b.) how often you have done each.

a. How do you feel about the following? *(Check one on each line)*

b. How often have you done the following? *(Check one on each line)*

Do not disapprove	*Mildly disapprove*	*Strongly disapprove*		*Never*	*Occasionally*	*Often*	
☐	☐	☐	Drinking alcoholic beverages on campus in violation of campus regulations	☐	☐	☐	21-
☐	☐	☐	Gambling on campus	☐	☐	☐	23-
☐	☐	☐	Pulling pranks on other students	☐	☐	☐	25-
☐	☐	☐	Destroying school property	☐	☐	☐	27-
☐	☐	☐	Disorderly conduct in the local community	☐	☐	☐	29-
☐	☐	☐	Over-cutting class	☐	☐	☐	31-
☐	☐	☐	Underlining or marking up library books	☐	☐	☐	33-
☐	☐	☐	Taking books from the library without properly checking them out	☐	☐	☐	35-
☐	☐	☐	Taking articles from the school store without paying for them	☐	☐	☐	37-
☐	☐	☐	Becoming friendly with a teacher in hopes of getting a better grade	☐	☐	☐	39-
☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	Getting drunk	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	41-

62. Since last September:

a. How many incidents do you know about where students have been brought to the attention of the authorities for:

(Write in the number of incidents)

	Total number of incidents you know about	**Number of incidents where you personally know the student(s) involved**	
Cheating and plagiarism	______	______	43-
Theft	______	______	47-
Destruction of property	______	______	51-
Sex misconduct	______	______	55-
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior	______	______	59-
b. How many incidents do you know of where students have been expelled or left school for disciplinary reasons (other than bad grades)?	______	______	63-

63. Students learn about rules and regulations in different ways. Which of the following were important sources of information about campus rules and regulations for you? (Rank them in order of importance to you.)

Published sources (e.g., student handbook, college bulletin, school newspaper)	______	67-
Informal conversations with other students	______	68-
Freshman orientation program or meetings	______	69-
Trial and error	______	70-

64. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about rules and regulations on your campus?

	Strongly agree	*Mildly agree*	*Not sure*	*Mildly disagree*	*Strongly disagree*	
Rules and regulations are too broadly defined to know exactly what a violation is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	71-
There are too many specific rules and regulations to keep them straight	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	72-
Students are poorly informed about rules and regulations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	73-
Authorities are not successful enough at catching rule breakers to prevent violations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	74-
Most of the rules serve no useful purpose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	75-
Violations are handled without adequate consideration by the authorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	76-
Punishments for violations are not severe enough	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	77-
Students learn what the rules and regulations are by being caught for violations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	78-
Students have no hand in making campus rules and regulations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	79-
Students object more to those enforcing rules than to the rules themselves	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	80-
	1	2	3	4	5	

65. Is there an Honor System on your campus? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 1-5:

If no, skip to question 70, section VI, page 15. 6-

66. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the Honor System on your campus?

	Strongly agree	*Mildly agree*	*Not sure*	*Mildly disagree*	*Strongly disagree*	
The interpretation of the Honor Code or Principle is too vague and indefinite	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	7-
The Honor System covers too many areas of conduct and too many different types of activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8-
Punishments for honor violations are too lenient	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	9-
The application of the Honor System depends too much on the personalities of those enforcing it	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10-
In general, students adhere more to the letter than to the spirit of the Honor System	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11-
	1	2	3	4	5	

67. How many students on your campus do you think would:

	Almost all	*Many*	*Half*	*Few*	*None or nearly none*	
Express their disapproval informally to an offender rather than report him for an honor violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12-
Report only honor violations of students they dislike personally	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13-
Report honor violations of their friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14-
Report no kind of honor violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15-
Report every kind of honor violation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16-
Report themselves for honor violations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17-
	1	2	3	4	5	

68. How likely are you to report others for honor violations in cases of the following types?

	The honor system does not apply	*Very likely*	*Fairly likely*	*Not likely*	
Cheating and plagiarism	☐	☐	☐	☐	18-
Theft	☐	☐	☐	☐	19-
Disorderly conduct or improper social behavior	☐	☐	☐	☐	20-
Misconduct regarding the possession or use of alcoholic beverages	☐	☐	☐	☐	21-
Misconduct in relations between students and members of the local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	22-
Riots or mob action	☐	☐	☐	☐	23-
	1	2	3	4	

69. How strongly committed are you to the Honor System on your campus?

(Check one)

I believe in it very strongly.________ ☐ 1
I think it a good idea.________ ☐ 2 24-
I don't care one way or the other.________ ☐ 3
I feel it should be done away with.________ ☐ 4

VI. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

70. About yourself:

a. Write in your age:________years 25-

b. Are you: Male ☐ 1 Female ☐ 2 27-

c. Are you: White ☐ 1 Negro ☐ 2 Oriental ☐ 3 Other ☐ 4 28-

d. In what religion were you brought up?

Protestant ☐ 1 Catholic ☐ 2 Jewish ☐ 3 Other ☐ 4 None ☐ 5 29-

e. How often do you attend religious services (other than required chapel, if any)?

Once a week or more.________ ☐ 1 Several times a year.________ ☐ 4 30-
Two or three times a month.________ ☐ 2 Never, or nearly never.________ ☐ 5
Once a month.________ ☐ 3

71. About your family and home background:

a. Are both your parents living? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 31-

If no, how old were you when your: father passed away?............ ________years 32-
mother passed away?............ ________years 34-

b. Are your parents divorced or separated? No ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 36-

If yes, how old were you when: they were separated?......... ________years 37-
they were divorced?......... ________years 39-

c. How far did your parents go in school? *(Check one in each column)*

Your father		Your mother	
☐ 1	Eighth grade or less	☐ 1	41-
☐ 2	Some high school, but did not finish	☐ 2	42-
☐ 3	High school graduate	☐ 3	
☐ 4	Some college, but did not finish	☐ 4	
☐ 5	College graduate	☐ 5	
☐ 6	Post-graduate study	☐ 6	

d. If your father is living, is he: working ☐ 1 unemployed ☐ 2 retired ☐ 3 43-

e. What is (or was) your father's occupation? (Be as specific as possible concerning type of work, position held.) 44-

____

f. About how much was your parents' income last year?

Less than $3,000.________ ☐ 1 $10,000 — $15,000.________ ☐ 5 46-
$3,000 — $5,000.________ ☐ 2 $15,000 — $25,000.________ ☐ 6
$5,000 — $7,500.________ ☐ 3 Over $25,000.________ ☐ 7
$7,500 — $10,000.________ ☐ 4 Don't know.________ ☐ 8

g. Circle the size of the town in which your parents now live.

Less than 2,500	2,500-5,000	5,000-15,000	15,000-50,000	50,000-200,000	Over 200,000	47-
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	

h. Circle the number of miles from your parents' home to your college:

0-5	5-10	10-25	25-50	50-100	100-250	250-500	500 or more	
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	*(7)*	*(8)*	48-

i. Are you an only child? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐

If no, write in the age and circle the sex (M or F) of each of your brothers and sisters (don't include yourself) from the eldest to the youngest. 59-

_____ M F _____ M F _____ M F _____ M F _____ M F _____ M F _____ M F 60-

1-5:

j. How would you characterise your home environment?

(Check one on each line)

	Very	*Fairly*	*Fairly*	*Very*		
Understanding	☐	☐	☐	☐	Not understanding	6-
Remote	☐	☐	☐	☐	Close	7-
Warm	☐	☐	☐	☐	Cold	8-
	1	2	3	4		

k. As a child who disciplined you most often? (Check one)

Father ☐ 1 Mother ☐ 2 Both about equally ☐ 3 Other ☐ 4 9-

l. How would you characterise the disciplinary measures taken by your parents?

	Very	*Fairly*	*Fairly*	*Very*		
Lenient	☐	☐	☐	☐	Severe	10-
Punitive	☐	☐	☐	☐	Corrective	11-
Just	☐	☐	☐	☐	Unjust	12-
	1	2	3	4		

72. About your high school background:

a. Check all of the following which characterise the high school from which you graduated.

Public	☐ 0	Single sex (all male or all female)	☐ 5	13-
Private	☐ 1	Boarding school	☐ 6	15-
Operated by a religious denomination	☐ 2	Military	☐ 7	17-
Vocational or manual training	☐ 3	Located in your hometown	☐ 8	19-
College preparatory	☐ 4	Located in the same town as your college	☐ 9	21-

b. Estimate roughly the number of students who attended your high school: ______ 23-

c. Compared to other students in your high school did you and your friends:

	More than others	*About the same as others*	*Less than others*	
Participate in extracurricular activities	☐	☐	☐	26-
Participate in athletics	☐	☐	☐	27-
Take an interest in studies and making good grades	☐	☐	☐	28-
Stir up excitement	☐	☐	☐	29-
Date and have parties	☐	☐	☐	30-
	1	2	3	

d. Were you a member of the leading crowd in your high school? 31-

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 Not sure ☐ 3

e. When you were in high school about how often did you:

	Never	*Once*	*A few times*	*Several times*	*Often*	
Lie to your parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32-
Take money from your parents without telling them about it	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	33-
Cut school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	34-
Smoke	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	35-
Drink beer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	36-
Drink liquor	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	37-
Shoplift	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	38-
Cheat on tests or exams	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	39-
	1	2	3	4	5	

f. For the students in your high school, estimate roughly what percentage: 40-

Cheated.......... _______%
Did not cheat..... _______%
100%

g. Of those students who cheated in high school, estimate roughly what percentage: 42-

Cheated frequently.... _______%
Cheated occasionally... _______%
100%

h. Estimate what proportion of your:

	More than ¾	*¾ to ½*	*½ to ¼*	*Less than ¼*	
High school class went to college________	☐	☐	☐	☐	44-
High school friends went to college________	☐	☐	☐	☐	45-
High school friends went to the same college as you________	☐	☐	☐	☐	46-
High school friends are still friends of yours________	☐	☐	☐	☐	47-
	1	2	3	4	

i. Rank the following groups in order of importance in helping you decide to go to college.

Your parents.................. _______ 48-
Your high school friends........ _______ 49-
Your high school teachers....... _______ 50-

j. Mention any other individuals or groups who may have helped you to decide to go to college.________ 51-
____

k. Circle your grade average in high school

A	A—	B+	B	B—	C+	C	C—	D+ or lower	
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*	*(5)*	*(6)*	*(7)*	*(8)*	*(9)*	52-